Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 9339 .C35 B7
Brook, B. 1776-1848.
Memoir of the life and
writings of Thomas

Shelf.....

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/memoiroflifewrit00broo

MEMOIR

OF THE

LIFE AND WRITINGS

OF

THOMAS CARTWRIGHT, B.D.,

THE DISTINGUISHED PURITAN REFORMER;

INCLUDING THE PRINCIPAL ECCLESIASTICAL MOVEMENTS IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

BY

THE REV. B. BROOK,

AUTHOR OF "THE LIVES OF THE PURITANS."

LONDON:

JOHN SNOW, 35, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1845.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY W. BLANCHARD AND SONS,
Warwick Lane, St. Paul's.

PREFACE.

The Memorials of great and good men, who have suffered for Christ, afford peculiar interest, and salutary instruction. While we admire the integrity of their purpose, and behold the ascendancy of their principles, with the triumphs of their piety, we are forcibly induced to cherish those maxims of truth which improve and adorn the character of man. By a familiarity with the sentiments and actions of such men, we imbibe their spirit, imitate their example, and become "followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises."

The Work now offered to the public furnishes the real character of the Reformation, with an account of its interruption by the secular power, and the efforts of the principal Reformers to carry it to a greater extent, pointing out the only legitimate principles of Reform. It brings under review the entire history of Mr. Cartwright, whose learned discussions, indefatigable labours, untiring zeal, and accumulated sufferings, exhibit no ordinary degree of piety and devotedness to God. He was distinguished as the leading puritan Reformer; and, with intense ardour, he engaged in a great moral conflict, in hope of obtaining a purer Reformation, with an extension of religious freedom. He was long assailed by unrighteous crimination and severe intolerance; but he fearlessly withstood the encroachment of ecclesiastical power, refused to barter his conscience for worldly emolument, and to degrade his principles by succumbing to a system of hierarchical domi-

nation. In these memorable struggles, not a breath adventured to impeach him of immorality or irreligion; and his only offence was an uncompromising adherence to his religious principles, from which no consideration on earth could divert his attention, or rend his attachment. By his writings and sufferings, Mr. Cartwright brought to light many hidden and important truths, which paved the way for better times, and laid a foundation on which the erection of a superstructure commenced, is still in progress, and, when completed, will form a bulwark securing to all classes the birthright of rational man.

The reader will perceive from the references given, that the materials of the Work are derived from numerous original Manuscripts, especially from the Lansdowne Collection in the British Museum; also from the stores of printed authorities. From these accumulated sources are collated numerous Memorials of pious fidelity and patient endurance, which contribute to amplify and enrich the Narrative. If the Work, with these advantages, present an entire portrait of Mr. Cartwright, combining ecclesiastical movements,—if it be found helpful in disseminating Scriptural views of Divine institutions, sustaining man's responsibility,—if it contribute to the exposure of ecclesiastical abuses, providing suitable remedies,—if it induce the reader to appreciate the holy administration of Jesus Christ, estimating Nonconformist antiquities,—and if the Memoir, by the blessing of God, prove instrumental in advancing the cause of truth and righteousness, the object of its publication will be fully accomplished.

Birmingham,
September 12*th*, 1845.

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
REC. FEB 1881
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY.

CONTENTS.

		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAP. I.	BIRTH AND EARLY HISTORY	37
CHAP. II.	EXPULSION FROM THE UNIVERSITY	51
CHAP. III.	REPLY TO WHITGIFT'S ANSWER TO THE ADMONITION	96
1.	*Standard of Judgment*	106
2.	*Election of Ministers*	109
3.	*Officers of Christian Churches*	111
4.	*Clerical Habits*	115
5.	*Bishops and Archbishops*	118
6.	*Authority of Princes in Ecclesiastical Matters*	122
7.	*Confirmation by a Bishop*	124
CHAP. IV.	OBSERVATIONS ON THIS CONTROVERSY	127
CHAP. V.	WHITGIFT'S DEFENCE AND CARTWRIGHT'S SECOND REPLY	163
1.	*Head of the Church*	169
2.	*Archbishops*	173
3.	*Election of Ministers*	185
4.	*Bishops in every Congregation*	190
5.	*Ecclesiastical Persons in Civil Offices*	196
CHAP. VI.	EXILE — RETURN — IMPRISONMENT — RELEASE — ECCLESIASTICAL REFORM	214
CHAP. VII.	REFUTATION OF THE RHEMISH TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT	254
1.	*Advantage of a Translation of the Scriptures*	269
2.	*Translation from the Latin Vulgate*	274
3.	*Method of Translation*	278

PAGE

Chap. VIII. Convened before the Bishop—State of the Hospital at Warwick—Dispute with Brownists—Before the High-commission—Committed to Prison . 291

Chap. IX. Arraigned before the High-commission and the Star Chamber 335

Chap. X. Continued Hardships and Release from Prison . 379

Chap. XI. Trials—Death—Character—Works—Conclusion . 428

INTRODUCTION.

The Christian religion is an illustrious exhibition of wisdom and mercy; and its promulgation was attended with remarkable power and glorious results. The apostles were meek and holy men, who went forth in humble guise, publishing salvation by Jesus Christ. Having received their Divine commission, they preached those doctrines which the rulers of the world disbelieved, and inculcated that spiritual worship for which they were persecuted. In obedience to their risen Lord, they proclaimed the gospel to perishing men; which, by the blessing of God, prevailed and triumphed over a sinful world. They considered religion a personal concern, requiring the solemn attention of every man; but never entertained the dangerous notion of employing secular power to enforce the truth of God. They confined their instructions to the commission they received, and sought to imbue the people with humility and holiness, peace and love. The learned Stillingfleet observes, "The grand commission the apostles were sent out with was only to teach what Christ commanded them. There is not the least intimation of any power given them to impose or require any thing beyond what he had spoken to them, or they were directed to by the immediate guidance of the Spirit of God."*

It cannot be doubted, that corruption and declension crept into churches at an early period, which paved the way for the novelties and oppressions which followed. All historians, however, agree, that a coalition between the church and the world had no existence till the days of Constantine the Great, who, having assumed a new order of legislation, incorporated the Christian religion with

* Irenicum, Pref.

the imperial government, constituting himself sovereign dictator of the church of God. Christian churches remained distinct, independent communities, till the fourth century, when the civil power forcibly seized the ecclesiastical government; and, by this extraordinary measure, the laws of the state were substituted for the laws of Christ. The new ecclesiastical assumption not only created the first great inlet of domination and corruption, but also forced upon the churches the fatal system of aggression and proscription, degrading and paralysing the influence of Christianity. Though the Lord Jesus had furnished all the laws, ordinances, and instructions pertaining to his churches, and they could not admit any other without degrading their character and betraying his cause; yet Constantine placed Christian churches in a position, till then absolutely unknown, and, by mere sovereignty, enacted laws to govern the kingdom of Christ! The distinction between the church and the world ceased from that hour. Pagan superstitions were blended with Christian institutions. But the unnatural admixture was effected by unclean hands, seeing Constantine was "disposed to give his sanction to any creed;"* and thenceforth undefiled religion was treated with scorn and violence. This change was the master-piece of evil, depriving Christianity of its original purity, and substituting a worldly institution, founded on worldly enactments, burdened with worldly observances, aiming at worldly purposes! Thus commenced the union of the church with the state; but religion, which had mightily prevailed under the pressure of persecution, pined away when pampered with wealth and luxury, exchanging light for darkness. The unrighteous admixture constituted a new species of ecclesiastical machinery, formed the great engine of aggrandizement, and proved the fruitful occasion of errors and superstitions; the whole of which resulted from the usurpation of power, the disruption of the free operation of the gospel, and enforcing subjection to traditionary observances: thus a melancholy gloom overspread Christendom!

The Emperor Constantine, at first, extended "absolute" religious freedom to all his subjects, and left every man amenable to God *alone* in all religious matters; but, having changed measures and unsheathed the sword of persecution, he pillaged and destroyed

* Milner's Church Hist. vol. ii. p. 66.

the churches of Jesus Christ!* Three centuries after the holy administration was fixed, Constantine, by usurpation and oppression more grievous than a thousand plagues, furnished the example for every subsequent persecution, and obtained the gratulation and applause of persecutors in every succeeding age.† Hitherto persecution had been the monopoly of pagan power; but henceforth it became the monopoly of professed Christians! In barbarous times, religion, being very little regarded, became crippled and paralysed by worldly patronage, which generated arrogance and domination; and ecclesiastical offices were appointed absolutely unknown among Christians. The assumption of power marred the beauty of religion, tarnished its purity, and weakened its influence—fettering and misleading the people—pampering the priesthood—subverting the immunities of the churches—reducing man to a state of vassalage—and coercing Christians to support those observances at which their souls revolted! The churches, thus metamorphosed by political power, assumed a new character; and were presently inundated by traditional fables and superstitious inventions, supplanting the doctrines and institutions of the New Testament. The professed ministers of Christ, from being shepherds of his flock, became state functionaries, and members of a worldly sanctuary. They were arranged into orders and degrees according to the artificial divisions of the empire, elevated to wealth and honour; but the spirit and power of religion withered and died. The Head of the church was discarded and forgotten: primitive piety was superseded by debasing superstition, dominant priestcraft, and fiery persecution.‡ The usurpation at the seat of empire swelled into a monstrous grievance, until antichrist assumed

* Fox, vol. i. p. 95, 113.—Euseb. Constan. b. i. c. 38; iii. 63.

† We are aware that some writers have undertaken to defend the character of Constantine; who, nevertheless, acknowledge not only that he superseded the independence of Christian churches, and united the highest ecclesiastical with his civil authority, justly styled the "assumption of ecclesiastical supremacy," but also that "some of his laws were severe even to cruelty, and that his moral conduct cannot in justice be maintained!" But the worst part of Constantine's character was, "that, as he grew older, he grew more culpable: oppressive in his family, oppressive in the government, oppressive by superfluous magnificence." And our author adds, "in vain do we look either for *wisdom* or *equity* in the ecclesiastical proceedings of Constantine or any of his family!"—*Waddington's Hist.* p. 78, 82; *Milner's Hist.* vol. ii. p. 49, 107.

‡ Campbell's Lect. vol. i. p. 61, 67.

the throne of God! The voice of the pontiff divided the nation into priests and vassals; the former arrogating to themselves apostolical succession, and leading the people blindfold. Salvation was no longer considered by faith in Jesus Christ, but held to be transmitted through official hands and traditional observances. To complete the ecclesiastical imposture, this mighty assumption claimed the character of infallibility and Divine!

The church and the world being amalgamated, mutually co-operated in achieving worldly aggrandizement. By secularizing and pampering the priesthood, the church became a formidable engine under the direction of the pontiff; until the Roman anti-christ claimed the wealth of nations, and trampled on the rights and eternal interests of the people. Appalling moral darkness and feudal vassalage reigned over Christendom nearly one thousand years, during which almost every spark of piety and freedom was extinguished, and the whole Christian economy assumed an earthly and oppressive character!

This was the state of things in Britain, when the Reformation first dawned upon the nation. The light of truth, which had been so long eclipsed, burst forth on the continent, then in this country; which, by its renovating and elevating power, called into existence a new generation, and kindled a flame which no power on earth could extinguish. By the introduction of printing, the circulation of the Bible in English, and other important occurrences in the reign of King Henry VIII., better principles obtained access to the minds of the people, and the light of the glorious gospel spread in every direction. This, however, was not the time of completing the Reformation. Henry was as much the pope of England, as the pontiff was of Rome; and popery, under another head, still triumphed in its most obnoxious forms. Though Henry's conduct was tragically oppressive and severe, yet, at the suggestion of Archbishop Cranmer, one of his last acts was to reform certain papistical observances.*

In the reign of King Edward VI., the Reformation began to shine with additional splendour; and Christianity, which had been so long obscured, was expected to appear in its native brightness, and spread its benign influence over all the land. The Christian

* Burnet, vol. ii. Rec. p. 236—238.

church through many generations had suffered under severe compulsory enactments, which, instead of advancing "pure and undefiled religion," had promoted darkness, misery, and death. It was, therefore, high time for the church to awake from its long slumber; to renounce that policy which had proved an absolute failure; and to retrace its steps by following the instructions of inspired truth. The principle which introduced Christianity, opened the door of Reformation. As religion increased, the errors of the priesthood diminished. By the agency of the pulpit and the press, light was diffused, abuses were exposed, and the word of the Lord triumphed over existing errors. The zealous protestants, disgusted with prevailing corruptions, called aloud for reformation; and they pressed forward in promoting the good work, refusing to wait the tardy movements of the state. But the clergy in general, being deeply involved in popish darkness, and filled with alarm for their worldly interest, opposed the Reformation, and defended existing abuses. Though they abhorred every particle of reform, and endeavoured to thwart every improvement, as endangering their craft; "yet," says Burnet, "they resolved to comply with any changes rather than lose their benefices!"*

The agency destined to liberate the truth of God, and emancipate religion from galling fetters, was the publication of the Scriptures in a language which the people understood. Myles Coverdale, in the late reign, had been employed in this important service; and he gave to his countrymen the inspired volume, which liberated them from former darkness and vassalage. The iron fetters, in which the people had for ages been held, were snapt asunder; so that the principles of unadulterated Christianity, when fully exhibited, were powerfully felt: and the translation of the Bible, especially in this reign, was the grand instrumentality not only of bringing to light, and of partially removing, the hidden things of darkness, but also of unfolding to the people "the unsearchable riches of Christ." Numerous improvements were effected in the state of the church, by which the gospel was disencumbered of many superstitious observances, and extensively disseminated among the people. Archbishop Cranmer, denominated a "great Scripturist," cherished deep commiseration for the people, maintained that the

* Burnet, vol. ii. p. 9, 24.

holy Scriptures constituted the *only standard* of Reformation, treating the decrees of councils, and the traditions of men, with comparative inattention. "From the word of God," said Cranmer, "princes may learn how to govern their subjects, and subjects learn how to obey their princes; and all persons may learn that faith and worship which God requires of them." The venerable primate, adopting this scriptural policy, was anxious to see the church entirely freed from the remnants of popery; and addressing the convocation, "he exhorted the clergy to give themselves to the study of the Scriptures, and to consider seriously what things were in the church that needed reformation; that so they might throw out *all the popish trash* that was not yet cast out."*

Cranmer and the Archbishop of York, with other bishops and divines, declared that, in the apostolic churches, the office of bishop and pastor was the same; and that in those times the members of the churches usually elected their own officers. Thirteen bishops and numerous other dignitaries subscribed that, in the New Testament, there was no distinction of degrees, except only those of bishops or pastors and deacons. The English Reformers recognised the foreign churches, though far from being episcopalian, as true churches of Jesus Christ, and invited a number of continental protestants to assist the Reformation in this country; who were instantly employed in ministerial functions, without the least regard to episcopal ordination, or the popish doctrine of apostolical succession. All protestants were anxious for the introduction of apostolical discipline. Dr. Cox complained bitterly of the opposition to this measure, and said, if apostolical discipline was not restored, "the kingdom of God would be taken from them." He also declared, that all things in the church ought to be "pure and simple," removed as far as possible "from the pomps and elements of the world." Peter Martyr strongly advocated the entire reformation of abuses, as authorized by the word of God; and the prudential advice of making only few changes, he called "a device of Satan to render the regress of popery more easy."†

It would be improper to omit the just and honourable principles

* Burnet, vol. ii. p. 40; Strype's Cranmer, p. 443. Appen. Pref.

† Burnet, vol. i. Rec. p. 223, 224; ii. 88; iii. 202.—Eccl. Mem. vol. ii. p. 305, 366.

of reform laid down by Bishop Hooper. He considered the principles of worldly policy and political expediency as absolutely inappropriate and unwarrantable, and appealed to the word of God as the only legitimate authority of the Reformation. "Jesus Christ," said the venerable prelate, "governs with his own laws only, and would have his subjects to know him, honour him, and obey him, as he hath commanded in his law. He binds the apostles and all the church unto the things which he taught them. Those who teach the people to know the church by the traditions of men, and the succession of bishops, teach wrong. Those two false opinions have given unto the succession of bishops power to interpret the Scripture, and power to make such laws in the churches as they pleased. God has given the civil magistrate power and authority to make laws for the commonwealth: but this is not to be admitted in the church, in which God hath given the gospel, and interpreted the same by his only Son."* On another occasion, he said, "I am sorry with all my heart to see the church of Christ degenerated into a civil policy, and the Holy Ghost made a captive and bondman to bishops' sees and palaces."†

The venerable prelate, addressing King Edward, said, "A thousand times shall your Majesty restore again the true ministry of the church, in case you remove and take away all the monuments and leavings of papistry; for as long as any of them remain, there remains also occasion of relapse into the abolished superstition of antichrist. As I see, in the writings of the prophets, that God requires the observation of his law only concerning religion; and threateneth all princes, priests, and prophets with his displeasure who neglect or contaminate it with their own cogitations; so I can do no less, however the world shall take my doings, than exhort and pray the magistrates to bring the church to her first perfection." Hooper then forcibly recommended, since the popish mass was removed, that all its "feathers, altars, vestments, and other superstitions" might be taken away, and the church of Christ decked as at the beginning.‡

We ought not to withhold the sentiments of the celebrated John Bradford, who, before his death, explicitly declared that God was

* Hooper's Declaration, p. 32. † Hooper's Confession, p. 218.
‡ Hooper's Sermons, Ded.

to be worshipped only according to the instructions of his written word, and not according to the traditions or devices of men; and he added, "In worshipping God, I ought in no point to follow the device or intent of any man or angel. And why? Because God requires that I should worship him as he hath appointed in his word."*

These are only specimens of the honourable sentiments entertained by the leading Reformers. Similar to these were the opinions of the king and council, who laboured to the uttermost to have all things, both in doctrine and discipline, regulated "most purely" according to the sacred volume, and that all Romish superstitions retained in the church might be wholly abolished. The king "had an early liking of all good and generous principles," and was remarkably "inclined to love and cherish true religion." He was particularly desirous of seeing the Reformation brought to a state of perfect maturity; but he deeply lamented the difficulties thrown in the way, and his own inability to promote apostolical discipline, owing principally to the deplorable character of those who occupied high stations in the church. Many of the bishops "understood religion little, and valued it less;" of whom the king observed, "Some for papistry, some for ignorance, some for their ill name, and some for all these, were unable to execute discipline."† Notwithstanding these embarrassments, the Reformation was promoted to a considerable extent. Saints and images were no longer allowed the honours of deity. Transubstantiation and the mass were no longer substituted for the Lord's Supper. Every one enjoyed the free use of the holy Scriptures in English. The word of God superseded human traditions. The worship of God was no longer conducted in a strange language. The marriage of the clergy was no longer prohibited. Purgatory and indulgences were no longer sanctioned. The great doctrine of salvation by Jesus Christ *alone* was fully set forth, and numerous other improvements followed.‡ The king intended a further advancement of the Reformation, and anxiously sought the removal of remaining abuses; but, by his early death, the good work, so auspiciously commenced, was interrupted and suppressed.

The accession of Queen Mary produced a mournful change.

* Bradford's Writings, p. 165, 379. † Burnet, vol. ii. Remains, p. 69.
‡ Life of Cranmer, p. 42.

We are told that superstition sprung up beyond belief, that cathedrals were mere dens of robbers, and that obstinate malice formed the character of the priesthood!* The whole fabric of reform was destroyed; and the church, under the control of this princess, lapsed into a state of popish darkness, with all its cruelties. Severe persecution failed, however, to recommend the Romish religion to the approbation of the people; but it contributed powerfully to enlighten the minds, and mature the views of the Reformers. The horrors of Mary's reign accomplished more to expose the errors of popery, than could the most strenuous efforts of protestants. The heroic deaths of the martyrs touched the hearts of men with pity and admiration; and the people were sick of breathing an atmosphere rank with the fumes of human blood.† The martyrs at the stake nobly exemplified the gospel of the grace of God. The circulation of the Scriptures, with other defences of reform, had, in the late reign, scattered the seed of Divine truth; and, though the progress of its growth was interrupted, yet the seed afterward vegetated and presented a promising harvest.

The death of Mary gave new life to the Reformers. She was succeeded by her sister Elizabeth, who was known to favour the Reformation, and a counter-revolution followed. The dazzling splendour of official power, and the ambiguous indications of human greatness, had a blighting influence on the religion of Jesus Christ. The late cruelties presented invaluable lessons and appropriate warnings against a continued departure from the simplicity of the gospel. To refuse instruction so plentifully administered, or, to admit a modification of the system, was a refusal to hear the voice of Providence, if not a rash invasion of Divine authority. The protracted horrors and enormities of popery having been fully developed, it might have been supposed that the conductors of reform would have derived sufficient warning and instruction, and so organized the church as to have prevented temporal power again enslaving the consciences of the people: but the assumption of former times was so congenial to the taste of those in power, and so deeply rooted in their minds, that it was no easy task to escape the iron grasp of spiritual despotism; especially as the human mind

* Life of Jewel, p. 13. † Burnet, vol. ii. p. 305.

had been so long locked up in nocturnal gloom, enslaved by disgusting superstition, and the wiles of dominant priestcraft. These were formidable obstacles to the reformation of former errors; and the assumption of power, as stated on the page of history, laid the foundation of nearly all the mischief which followed, not only at the period of the Reformation, but also through every subsequent period to the present time.

The two houses of parliament having assembled, their first business was to rescind those laws relating to religion which had been passed in the late reign; and they were repealed as easily as they had been enacted. By the "Act of Supremacy," which all the bishops strenuously opposed, Queen Elizabeth was created supreme *governess* of the church; and thus, by this Act, her Majesty was invested with the whole spiritual power to repress all heresies, establish or repeal all canons, alter every point of discipline, and ordain and establish any rites or ceremonies she pleased.* Invested with this extraordinary power, her Majesty devised and appointed a new ecclesiastical court, called "The Court of High-Commission;" † and, being furnished with the keys of ecclesiastical discipline, she appointed whatsoever rites and observances she pleased, and nominated persons to all the high offices in the church. Elizabeth, armed with extensive authority, dismissed the claims of the pontiff from her dominions, and declared herself "Supreme Governor of the Church of England." Her Majesty appointed the convocation of 1562, to review the doctrine and discipline of the church, when the Thirty-nine Articles were adopted, and appointed to be subscribed by all the clergy in the kingdom. Archbishop Parker reminded the assembly that they had an opportunity of perfecting the Reformation, and that the queen and the nobility were desirous that the good work should be accomplished. Notwithstanding these flattering prospects, after long discussion, the worthy Reformers were defeated, and the good work, by the

* Hume's Hist. vol. v. p. 10.

† On the adoption of this Commission, the leading clergy craftily recommended that the principal members should be clergymen that the laity might be "kept under;" who, "having groaned so long under the tyranny of an ecclesiastical yoke," seemed disposed to return the compliment upon the clergy. The power of this court, our author adds, was a "great stretch of the supremacy;" but this was attempted to be extenuated by the power which lay-chancellors had exercised: "so one abuse was made the excuse for another!"—*Burnet*, vol. ii. p. 387, 400, 401.

opposition of the popish party, was left unfinished; and the secular hierarchy was maintained entire.*

Her Majesty proceeded to rebuild the ecclesiastical edifice erected by her brother Edward; but there was a very material difference in the spirit and design of the two reforming sovereigns. Edward, from the stern opposition of the catholics, lamented that he could not restore the primitive discipline, and a more pure reformation: but Elizabeth considered that her brother had reformed *too far*, and resolved that the church should be placed in nearer approximation to that of Rome. The queen's protestantism had a strong leaning towards popery; and it was not her fault that she was not reconciled to the court of Rome, to which, on her accession, she dispatched an envoy, stating her readiness for such reconciliation. Her Majesty was strongly inclined to retain images in places of worship; and, even after they had been generally ejected from the churches, she endeavoured to persuade the bishops to restore them as in times of popery.† In this attempt, however, her Majesty was vehemently opposed by the reforming bishops and divines, who protested that the measure was against their consciences, contrary to the word of God, and a dangerous snare to souls; therefore, they earnestly implored that "the polluted church might be clearly purged of these evils." They could not consent to retain images in places of worship, because it would be offensive to God, sanction "error, superstition, and idolatry," and promote "the ruin of souls" committed to their charge.‡

Notwithstanding these remonstrances, her Majesty retained a crucifix upon the altar, with lights burning before it, in the royal chapel; when three bishops, all in rich copes, officiated before the idol. Her Majesty more than once protested that she acknowledged the doctrine of the real presence, and also that she sometimes prayed to the Virgin Mary.§ || The queen had a lurking

* Strype's Annals, vol. i. p. 325—357; Hume, vol. v. p. 149.

† Burnet, vol. ii. p. 376; Pictorial Hist. vol. ii. p. 737; Heylin's Refor. p. 124; Strype's Parker, p. 96.

‡ Burnet, vol. ii. p. 397; Rec. p. 349.

§ Burnet, vol. iii. p. 292; Ellis' Original Letters, p. 270.

|| We find it recorded that Mr. Strype, having noticed Queen Elizabeth's inclination to popish errors, was assailed by Archbishop Tennison and other ecclesiastical dignitaries, who pressed him to alter what he had published of Elizabeth's favouring popery, lest he should give "advantage to the papists!"—*Ellis' Original Letters*, p. 269—271.

tendency toward Romish doctrines, a fondness for outward splendour in public worship, and was with difficulty restrained from prohibiting the marriage of the clergy.* Her Majesty, instead of reforming the church of numerous popish observances, wished every thing to remain as near as possible conformable to the popish ritual; and, having appointed certain learned divines to review King Edward's liturgy, she commanded them to strike out all passages that were offensive to the pope: so the liturgy, in obedience to her Majesty's instructions, was well adapted to the approbation of Roman catholics.† And the liturgy was, indeed, "so little differing from the old form" used in popery, that "most of the papists in England" attended the ordinary public service till the eleventh year of Elizabeth, when the pope's bull enforced their separation from the Anglican church.‡ Her Majesty commanded that the Lord's table should be placed in the form of an altar, that reverence should be made at the name of Jesus, and that all the festivals appointed by the Romish church in commemoration of departed saints should be observed as in times of popery. In the reign of Edward, the popish habits were not pressed upon the clergy, and the copes were then taken away; but both were restored under Elizabeth, which was considered not as completing, but impeding the Reformation. Her Majesty desired universal dominion, and invested her bishops with vast power; which, but for her masculine sense, would have been put aside with scorn.§ So that the Reformation under Queen Elizabeth, instead of being brought to maturity, fell far short of that under King Edward, owing to her Majesty's love of magnificence in religion, and in accommodation to the views of the catholics.‖

A better state of things might have been expected, and its attainment was then comparatively easy. Her Majesty had the happiest opportunity ever vouchsafed to any sovereign of establish-

* Queen Elizabeth sometimes testified her dislike of clergy marriage: and it is recorded that her Majesty having feasted at the table of Archbishop Parker, whom she highly respected, and at parting her Majesty gave the primate the warmest thanks; then looking on his wife, she said, "*Madam*, I may not call you; and *Mistress*, I am ashamed to call you; so I know not what to call you—but yet I do thank you."—*Dod's Church Hist.* vol. ii. p. 150.

† Strype, vol. i. p. 132; Burnet, vol. ii. p. 392; Heylin's Pres. p. 259.

‡ D'Ewes, p. 30. § Baker's MSS. vol. vi. p. 353; Forster's Statesmen, vol. i. p. 64.

‖ Burnet, vol. ii. p. 376; iii. 305.—Strype, vol. i. p. 177.

ing perfect freedom of conscience throughout her dominions, without danger to her government, and without scandal to any large party among her subjects. The nation, as it was clearly ready to profess either the popish or protestant religion, would, beyond all doubt, have been ready to admit religious freedom. Unhappily for the Christian church, as well for her Majesty's honour and for the public peace, Elizabeth adopted a policy from the effects of which the empire is still suffering.*

The ecclesiastical policy was on many accounts very exceptionable, and needed much revision; nor was the famous "Act of Uniformity" an exception. This Act decided by penal force, that all the people of England should be protestants, that all the churches in England should be protestant churches, and that all the church-lands, then belonging to catholics, should henceforth be protestant property! This memorable statute declared, that every clergyman who did not in all things conform to the public service should, "for the first offence, forfeit all his spiritual benefices and suffer imprisonment six months,—for the second offence, suffer imprisonment one year, and be deprived of all his spiritual promotions,—and for the third offence, be deprived of all his spiritual promotions, and suffer imprisonment during life!" It further enacted, that any person who wrote or spoke against the Prayer-book, or induced any minister to practise nonconformity, should forfeit, "for the first offence, one hundred marks,—for the second offence, four hundred marks,—and for the third offence, all his goods and chattels, and suffer imprisonment during life!" It also commanded, "that every person inhabiting her Majesty's dominions should diligently and faithfully resort to his parish church every Sunday, and other days ordained as holy-days, upon pain of the censures of the church; and that every person so offending should forfeit twelve-pence, to be levied by the churchwardens by way of distress!"†

The people might bow their necks, and tamely submit to this yoke. But he who "loved the church, and gave himself for it," could hardly be supposed to have left these arrangements to the discretion of man. Jesus Christ is King in his own kingdom. Possessing this high office, he neither invades the authority, nor usurps the jurisdiction of earthly monarchs; but his government extends

* Macaulay's Essays, vol. ii. p. 30. † Sparrow's Collec. pp. 111—115.

to those spiritual interests which are far above their province, and over which they are absolutely unable to exercise jurisdiction. He does not disturb their affairs, and they ought not to invade his kingdom. Jesus Christ and earthly monarchs have their distinct empires. Consciences and souls belong to Him—civil and secular affairs to them. The Lord Jesus has sufficient authority and ability to manage his own concerns, and, by his appointed agency, to govern his own subjects; but earthly rulers, who have attempted to do this for him, have, as the page of history shows, invariably betrayed their impotency, and failed in the enterprise.

The above ecclesiastical enactments, instead of promoting true religion, assumed a power which God never gave to man. The unrighteous measure secularized the priesthood, and mislead the people, by intermixing religion with state politics and popish observances. Mr. Scott, the venerable commentator, says, "The foundation of the Anglican church, as laid at the Reformation by the authority of the prince and parliament, was such as suited to connect the church too closely with the governing powers, and to give strong temptation to a mercenary, time-serving spirit in the clergy, especially the superior orders."* Those in power might have known that penal force was equally powerless to bend men's minds to religion as to suppress the wind of heaven. The Christian religion was not of earthly origin, but derived from God; by whose authority, and not by penal statutes, it is enforced on the souls of the people. The celebrated Milton observed, that no creature can know how God would be worshipped unless God reveal it; and this he hath revealed in the holy Scriptures, "with the strictest command to reject all other traditions and alterations whatsoever."† The reader must also be aware, that the doctrine and worship prescribed in the gospel were of too delicate and too sacred a nature to be regulated by penal statutes. But when legislators enforced religion by coercive edicts, who can help seeing that they invaded the province of the Deity, sowed the seeds of discord among the people, and, contrary to the obvious intentions of Christianity, attempted to promote religion by the terror of penal sanctions? These mistaken notions have prevailed in every age since the rise of antichrist, and doubtless will continue to pervert the Saviour's administration so long as religion remains under the

* Scott's Letters, p. 229. † Milton on True Religion.

control of worldly power. It must also be borne in mind that God prescribed the whole of that service which was due to him, and that no part of it could admit the least addition or alteration from man. But when men require those things in religion which God has not required, or set aside those which he has enjoined, they obviously encroach on his prerogative,—by the former they usurp his throne—by the latter they annul his laws!

While her Majesty claimed dominion over the churches, she omitted to furnish a satisfactory instrument conveying to her this extraordinary jurisdiction. The act of supremacy might have been pleaded; but the transfusion of *spiritual* supremacy by act of parliament supplied an absurdity equalled only by its folly and injustice. Will any man in the exercise of sober reason conclude, that the two houses of Westminster had sufficient ability to create and implant *spiritual* jurisdiction in the mind and office of the royal princess? The Romish usurpation presented attractions too powerful to be resisted; so unlimited spiritual dominion was considered too valuable to be surrendered, especially as connected, by a very simple analogy, with unlimited temporal dominion. This dominion, by the acts of supremacy and uniformity, was placed at the absolute disposal of the sovereign, who, it is added, "thus formally assumed the cast-off robes of the pope."* But if Elizabeth did not receive a Divine commission, was it not impossible that her Majesty could legitimately possess this marvellous jurisdiction? The office of prescribing the faith and devotions of the people, and also of punishing offences committed against God, which the Great Judge had challenged as belonging exclusively to Himself, was at this period accounted proper for a mortal! not because she was *wise*, but because she was *powerful!* Hence arose all the mischief which followed.

The reader is aware that nothing short of the broad seal of heaven could authorize so extraordinary a jurisdiction; but the assumption, that Christianity conveyed spiritual jurisdiction to princes, was gratuitous and untrue, which any one will ascertain on the slightest examination.† Queen Elizabeth made no pretensions

* Forster's Statesmen, vol. i. p. 60.

† When the spiritual supremacy was under discussion in the House of Lords, in 1559, the Archbishop of York recommended their lordships to consider whether they had authority to give, and her Majesty ability to receive, *spiritual* supremacy. If they main-

to Divine inspiration, nor to any documentary investment from heaven; therefore, the severe compulsory deeds on record proclaim her Majesty's outrage on Christianity, as well as on the birthright of conscience. We are informed, that Elizabeth had visited Queen Mary on her death-bed, who requested her not to make any alteration in religion; to which Elizabeth replied, "The word of God shall be the only foundation and rule of my religion."* But, surely, her Majesty must have forgotten this just and honourable avowal, when she constituted new obligations, and disallowed her subjects to regulate their religion by the same rule. Though the subjects of the empire were responsible to God *alone* in all matters of faith and worship, yet, by the measures adopted, they were placed in an awkward dilemma, by being arraigned before another tribunal, and made responsible to mortals: the fearful consequences of which will be seen in the day of final retribution!

The parliamentary regulations already in force were sufficiently oppressive; yet, in further degradation of religion, it was deemed necessary to adopt more stringent measures, constraining all persons to attend the public service of the church. For this purpose a law was made, which enacted that every person, above the age of sixteen, who did not repair to some church or usual place of Common-prayer, according to the Act of Uniformity, "should forfeit *twenty pounds* per month to the queen, and suffer imprisonment till paid! Those who were absent for *twelve* months should, in addition to the former fine, be bound with two sufficient sureties of *two hundred* pounds until they conformed! And every schoolmaster who did not attend the Common-prayer should forfeit *ten* pounds a month, be disabled from teaching school, and suffer one year's imprisonment!"† A learned churchman observes, that it was the character of the Whore of Babylon that she made merchandise of souls; and adds, "This was little better."‡

The prerogative assumed by this act betrayed a species of

tained the affirmative, he demanded their warrant and commission from the word of God; but, if they were unable to do this, he added, "then you may be well assured, and persuade yourselves, that you have not sufficient authority to make her Highness supreme head of the church of Christ in this realm."—*Dod's Church Hist.* vol. ii. p. 248.

* Zurich Letters, p. 4.

† Burn's Eccl. Law, vol. ii. p. 146; Strype's Whitgift, p. 95.

‡ Fuller, b. ix. p. 131.

arrogance and despotism perhaps not surpassed in the history of man, treating the people as abject slaves, or living machines under the iron hand of power. What could exhibit more palpable absurdity, than that of controlling man's intercourse with God by act of parliament? And what could display a greater degree of human folly, or more manifest usurpation of the prerogative of God? By this extraordinary statute, the will of man, not the authority of God, was made the rule of obedience, even in the most solemn acts of worshipping the Deity! Those who could not conscientiously attend the established worship, and were unable to pay the enormous fines, could only expect to spend their days in prison, where multitudes languished and died. By these violent measures, the legislature, instead of crushing those who resisted these oppressions, or reconciling them to the church, forced them farther from its enclosure. Men of conscience could not be beaten from their principles by fines and imprisonment; much less could they esteem a church fighting with such weapons. It is difficult to find language to set forth the enormity of this measure, which opposed the benign spirit of Christianity, erected a formidable barrier against the free operation of the gospel, and betrayed an assumption of the untransferrable prerogative of God! This act reduced the people to the most abject condition, made them the miserable victims of cruel oppression, robbed them of the richest gift of God, and interposed, by civil force, between man and his Maker, dictating to the one and disregarding the authority of the other. Many other severe enactments were adopted, which it is unnecessary to enumerate. But, if the contrivers of this statute had recollected that religion was a personal concern, and a subject absolutely unfit to be arraigned and condemned at an earthly tribunal, they would have been struck with horror at employing these arbitrary enactments to regulate man's intercourse with his Maker. And what could be more offensive to the Majesty of heaven, than coercive acts between the creature and the Creator? Compulsory force is, moreover, absolutely unavailable to promote the religion which God has prescribed to man; but that religion itself furnishes all-sufficient principle for securing all the objects of the Divine administration. When will men open their eyes to see, and be honest enough to admit, that to God *alone* are all men

responsible for their religious belief and practice? How marvellously slow have men been in receiving this very obvious truth! The wise and the good will doubtless agree, that the period has arrived when the community ought to be disabused, when the errors of former times ought to be openly discarded, and when a sounder philosophy, sustained by the omnipotence of truth, ought to govern the minds of all classes of society.

Those celebrated men who had merged from popish darkness, and who, under God, were instrumental of promoting the Reformation, stood forth, the uncompromising champions in defence of truth, against the pomp and cunning of priestcraft, supported by the secular power. On the accession of Elizabeth, the exiles returned to their native country. They had, during the reign of Mary, been placed in circumstances of adversity, yet in the school of instruction, where they had learned to appreciate the grand principles of the Reformation. They were, on their return, regarded with general veneration, on account of their zeal in religion, and their past sufferings: they ventured, therefore, to divulge their principles, and insisted on the necessity of a purer Reformation than that which was established; nor, says Hume, did they want countenance from many considerable persons in her Majesty's council. But Elizabeth wished to bring the public worship still nearer the Romish ritual; and she considered that the Reformation had already gone too far in shaking off the ancient forms and observances.* The learned Reformers, under extreme mortification and disappointment, struggled hard to obtain a better state of things; but their noble efforts were thwarted, and their intentions misrepresented. The foregoing statements clearly prove that the Reformers made no pretensions to a perfect work, and were strangers to those extravagant notions which were adopted by the fond admirers of the hierarchy. They were far from believing that the imposition of the hands of a bishop was essential to the validity of ordination; and they would not have owned those as protestants who would have ventured to insinuate that, where this was wanting, there was no Christian ministry, no ordinances, no church, and, perhaps, no salvation!† These semi-popery notions originated in mental darkness and gross superstí-

* Hume's Hist. vol. v. p. 153. † M'Crie's Knox, vol. i. p. 107.

tion, aiding the cause of priestcraft, and perverting the gospel of Christ.

The Reformers employed every suitable exertion to obtain a greater degree of purity in the church: and the reader will doubtless be gratified with a brief record of the sentiments of certain leading characters at this interesting period. When Dr. Parker was pressed to accept the archbishopric of Canterbury, he repeatedly remonstrated against it, and reminded the queen that "his conscience to Almighty God constrained" him to decline the offered preferment.* The learned Jewel, on his way home from exile, wished his friends might not act with too much worldly policy in the cause of God: and he afterwards declared that the title of "head of the church" could not in justice be given to any mortal, since it was due only to Jesus Christ; and that such titles, having been grievously abused by antichrist, ought to be utterly abolished from a reformed church.† In his correspondence with Peter Martyr, he said, "As heretofore Christ was *cast out* by his enemies; so he is now *kept out* by his friends." "Those very things which you and I have often laughed at, are now seriously and solemnly entertained, as if the Christian religion could not exist without tawdry. Our minds, indeed, are not sufficiently disengaged to make these fooleries of much importance. Others are seeking after a *golden,* or, as it seems to me, a *leaden* mediocrity; and are crying out, that the *half* is better than the *whole.*" ‡

The learned prelate, describing the episcopal improvements, said, "We require our bishops to be pastors, labourers, and watchmen; and, that this may be the more readily brought to pass, the wealth of the bishops is now diminished and reduced to a reasonable amount, to the end that, being relieved from royal pomp and courtly bustle, they may with greater ease and diligence employ their leisure in attending to the flock of Christ.§ In a letter to Martyr, dated November 5, 1559, he said, "As to what you write respecting religion and the theatrical habits, I heartily wish it could be accomplished. We on our parts have not been wanting to so good a cause. But those persons who have taken such delight in these matters have followed, I believe, the ignorance

* Burnet, vol. ii. Rec. p. 353—362.
† Life of Jewel, p. 9.
‡ Zurich Letters, p. 8, 17, 23.
§ Zurich Letters, p. 51.

of the priests; and, when they found them to be no better than mere logs of wood, without talent, or learning, or morality, they were willing at least to commend themselves to the people by that comical dress. These ridiculous trifles are, indeed, as you very properly observe, the relics of the Amorites. I wish that they may be taken away, and extirpated even to the lowest roots: neither my voice nor exertions shall be wanting to effect that object."

During the same month, he wrote again to Martyr, saying, "As to ceremonies and maskings, there is a little too much foolery. That little silver cross, of ill omen, still maintains its place in the queen's chapel. Wretched me! this thing will soon be drawn into a precedent. There was at one time some hope of its being removed; and we all of us diligently exerted ourselves, and still continue to do, that it might be so. But, as far as I perceive, it is now a hopeless case: such is the obstinacy of some minds."*

* Some further account of the queen's crucifix may not be unacceptable to the reader. Early in the year 1560, Bishop Sandys said, "That her Majesty considered it an advantage to the church that the image of Christ crucified, together with Mary and John, should be placed, as heretofore, in some conspicuous part of the church, where they might be more readily seen by all the people. Some of us thought far otherwise; because the ignorant and superstitious multitude are in the habit of paying adoration to this idol above others." Towards the close of this year, Bishop Jewel informed Martyr that the controversy about the crucifix was then at its height; adding, "You would scarcely believe to what a degree of insanity some persons, who once had some show of common sense, have been carried upon so foolish a subject. A disputation upon this subject will take place to-morrow. The moderators will be persons selected from the council. The disputants on one side are Archbishop Parker and Bishop Cox, and on the other Bishop Grindal and myself. The decision rests with the judges. I smile, however, when I think with what grave and solid reasons they will defend their little cross. As far as I can conjecture, I shall not again write to you as a bishop. Matters are come to that pass, that either the crosses of silver and tin, which we have everywhere broken in pieces, must be restored, or our bishoprics relinquished." Bishop Parkhurst, writing to Bullinger in 1562, said, "Lo! good news is brought to me, that the crucifix and candlesticks in the queen's chapel are broken in pieces, and reduced to ashes. A good riddance of such a cross! It has continued there too long already, to the great grief of the godly, and the cherishing of I know not what expectations of the papists." Sir Francis Knollys, one of her Majesty's privy council, denominated the crucifix and its apparatus "toys" and "enormities;" and, of the demolition of the idol, it is recorded that the massy crucifix remained some years on the table of the royal chapel by order of Queen Elizabeth, until Peach, the queen's fool, broke it in pieces, at the instigation of Sir Francis Knollys! But her Majesty's idol was not to be disposed of in this way; and we find that the crucifix, with its diversified apparatus, was soon after restored again to its former position, where it remained in the year 1563. It is further recorded, that Bishop

Upwards of two years later, addressing Martyr, he said, "Now that the full light of the Gospel has shone forth, the very vestiges of error must, as far as possible, be removed, together with the rubbish, and, as the saying is, with the very dust." And, in his letter to Bullinger and Lavater in 1566, he said, "I wish that all, even the slightest vestiges of popery, might be removed from our churches, and above all from our minds. But the queen will not endure the least alteration in matters of religion." * The learned prelate, in his celebrated "Apologie," maintained that Jesus Christ was the only prince in his kingdom; and that, "by the Scriptures of God, a bishop and a priest were all one, and there was no difference." †

Bishop Sandys, whose proceedings will receive some attention, addressed a letter to Archbishop Parker in 1559, reminding his grace that the Prayer-book still retained the ceremonies observed in the beginning of the reign of King Edward, until it should please her Majesty to give orders concerning them; but that the clergy did not consider themselves as required to observe them, nor yet authorized to take them away. He also stated that the bishops would give up their livings, rather than swear that the queen was supreme head of the church; and that her Majesty's opposition to clerical marriages "was nothing else but to bastardize their children!" ‡ This venerable prelate strongly opposed the compulsory imposition of conformity; and, in the convocation of 1562, he presented a paper recommending the adoption of an improved system of ecclesiastical government and discipline, with the abolition of popish abuses retained in the church, which, he said, were "needless and very superstitious." § Addressing Peter Martyr, he bitterly lamented that the popish habits were still used in the church of England; but "he hoped they would be soon taken away." He said they were retained on pretence of promoting

Cox was appointed to administer the sacrament to her Majesty in the royal chapel: but having long refused, as matter of conscience, to officiate in that place which was so dishonoured by images, he could not be induced to comply until he had incurred her Majesty's displeasure; and when he did comply, it was "with a trembling conscience!"—*Zurich Letters*, p. 66, 68, 74, 122, 129; *Miscil. MSS.* vol. xv. p. 72; *Ward's Diary*, p. 161; *Brit. Biog.* vol. iii. p. 39.

* Zurich Letters, p. 52, 55, 100, 149. † Strype, vol. i. p. 177.

‡ Burnet, vol. ii. Rec. p. 332. § Zurich Letters, p. 74; Strype, vol. i. p. 336.

"Christian unity," but they occasioned "the greatest divisions;" and he raised so formidable an opposition against retaining popish superstitions in the Established Church, that he was in danger of incurring the displeasure of the queen and of being deprived of his bishopric.*

Grindal, in like manner, expressed great dissatisfaction at the imperfect state of the Reformation; and, when nominated to the see of London, he wrote to Peter Martyr, inquiring whether bishops might lawfully observe those things which had been so "long holden in superstitious estimation." The learned foreigner recommended him to "teach and speak against them," and reminded him that, when he was canon of Christ's church, "he constantly refused the clerical habits." † Grindal, however, "remained under scruples of conscience concerning the habits and ceremonies required of bishops." ‡ The episcopal observances, in his opinion, "carried the appearance of the mass, and were the remainders of popery." Bullinger, therefore, openly declared that he ought to refuse them, lest his example should be a scandal to others. § Grindal, writing to Bullinger in 1566, said, "We, who are now bishops, on our first return, and before we entered on our ministry, contended long and earnestly for the removal of those things which have occasioned the present dispute; but we were unable to prevail either with the queen or the parliament." ‖

Bishop Horn reminded Bullinger that the queen held the helm, and directed all things according to her sovereign pleasure; but that the Reformers earnestly implored Almighty God "to turn, at length, the sails to another quarter." He also reminded Gaulter that "the wearing of square caps and surplices was continued to the clergy, though without any superstitious conceit, which was expressly guarded against by the terms of the act." He added, "We certainly hope to repeal this clause of the act next session; but I wait your opinion, whether we can do what we are thus doing with a safe conscience!" ¶ In the joint letter of Grindal and Horn, addressed to Bullinger and Gaulter, dated February 6th,

* Burnet, vol. iii. p. 291; Biog. Brit. vol. v. p. 3593.
† Soames' Elizabeth, p. 22. ‡ Strype's Grindal, p. 28.
§ Burnet, vol. iii. p. 302. ‖ Zurich Letters, p. 169.
¶ Zurich Letters, p. 143, 248.

1567, they said, "We most solemnly make oath, that we have hitherto laboured with all earnestness, fidelity, and diligence, to effect what our brethren require. But now we are brought into such straits, what is to be done we leave you to conjecture; but, since we cannot do what we would, we should do in the Lord what we can." They added, "Although we are unable to remove all the abuses of this fiscal court," the court of faculties, "and also some others, yet we do not cease to find fault with and censure them, and send them back to that hell from whence they proceeded."*

Dr. Cox, having to preach the sermon at the opening of the first parliament, earnestly exhorted the two houses to banish all popish innovations and corruptions, and restore religion to its primitive purity! After he had been bishop about twelve years, he signified to Gaulter, "We do not know of any godly fathers in approval of the popish dress, which we seriously reject and condemn equally with themselves," the reforming puritans! This stern prelate, writing to Martyr, said, "We are constrained, to our great distress of mind, to tolerate in our churches the image of the cross and him who was crucified: the Lord must be entreated that this stumbling-block may at length be removed."† Bishop Parkhurst repeatedly refused to be made a bishop, "keeping," as he said, "his neck out of the halter;" and he observed that some things still remained in the church which were unsatisfactory to his mind, but he hoped for an improvement; and he was decidedly partial to the puritan school of theology.‡

Bishop Pilkington returned from exile with painful apprehensions of "unprofitable ceremonies." He showed the inconsistency of rejecting popery, yet clinging to its "holy relics." He considered the abuses retained in the church were not approved, but only to be observed till they could be more conveniently removed. "Though things," said he, "may be borne with for Christian liberty's sake for a time, in hope to win the weak, yet when liberty is turned to necessity, it is evil, and no longer liberty; and that which was for winning the weak, suffered for a time, is become the confirming of

* Zurich Letters, p. 177, 181.

† Brit. Biog. vol. iii. p. 39; Zurich Letters, p. 66, 237.

‡ Zurich Letters, p. 61, 91; Soames' Elizabeth, p. 200.

the froward in their obstinateness." He morcover strongly recommended the exercise of lenity and forbearance towards scrupulous ministers, as necessary to secure a sufficient supply of faithful preachers; "since many were determined to abandon their functions and livings rather than assume any appearance of popery." He complained of disputes concerning vestments and the ecclesiastical constitution; at which pious persons lamented, atheists laughed, and the papists, who blew the coals, were full of hopes in favour of popery. He confessed that the bishops suffered "many things against their hearts," and under which "they groaned;" but they could not remove the burdens, which were continued by the authority of the queen.* In accordance with these statements, the first bishops that were made in Elizabeth's reign were Jewel, Grindal, Horn, Sandys, Cox, Parkhurst, and Bentham, who laboured all they could that all the papistical ceremonies might be entirely laid aside. But they could not obtain these improvements from the queen and the parliament.†

Dean Whittingham inquired, "Can that be called true Christian liberty where a yoke is laid on the necks of the disciples—where the conscience is clogged with impositions—where faithful preachers are threatened with deprivations—where the regular dispensation of the word of God is interrupted—where congregations are robbed of their learned and godly pastors—and where the holy sacraments are made subject to superstitious and idolatrous vestments? When I consider that Jereboam maintained his calves in Dan and Bethel under the plausible name of policy, it makes me tremble to see the popish ornaments set forth under the same pretence. If we compel the servants of Christ to conform unto the papists, I greatly fear we shall return again to popery."‡ The learned Dr. Humphrey, addressing the queen, said, "Oh, most noble princess, I do in most humble sort request and earnestly desire that your Majesty would seriously and attentively consider the majesty of the glorious gospel, the equity of the cause, the small number of workmen, the greatness of the harvest, the multitude of tares, the grievousness of the punishment, the lightness of the fault, the

* Soames' Elizabeth, p. 23, 49; Burnet, vol. iii. p. 316.
† Strype's Annals, vol. i. p. 177. ‡ Strype's Parker, Appen. p. 43.

sighs of the good, the triumphs of the wicked, and the mischief of the times."*

Bullinger reminded Bishop Horn, if he were asked whether he approved of those who enacted laws for retaining "the dregs of popery?" he should "candidly and freely answer, that he did not approve of them;" and added, "For they either acted too imprudently if they were on our side, or else they treacherously laid snares for the liberty of the churches. In the mean while, let her most serene Majesty and the most illustrious nobles of the realm be instructed, urged, and pressed no longer to retain and defile the Reformation with dregs and filthiness of this kind, nor to give occasion to the neighbouring churches of Scotland and France to indulge any suspicion of disunion."† Gaulter considered the adoption of a few changes to be "according to a carnal judgment," and was to be justly ascribed to "the public enemy of man's salvation;" and he warned those who suffered abuses to remain, that "afterward they would scarcely be able to eradicate them by all their efforts and struggles."‡

The reforming divines deliberately declared "that it was clear from the epistles which St. Paul wrote to the different churches, that every church had power in itself to order the forms of its worship, and the administration of the sacraments." And during the first three centuries this was done "by mutual advice, rather than by authority."§ The Reformers in general, greatly to their honour, advocated the cause of a thorough reformation; maintaining that the outward resemblance of the Romish church would encourage the people in superstition, nourish in them the errors of popery, and leave them an easy prey to antichristian proselytism, which was found to be the unhappy result. They recommended, therefore, that every thing ought to be removed as far as possible from the corruptions of the Romish church; and they laboured to the uttermost that all popish abuses might be removed out of the church; but they were utterly defeated by the power of the queen, who continually refused to perfect the Reformation.‖ The renowned philanthropists, thwarted by political power, did not renounce their

* Baker's MSS. vol. vi. p. 353. † Zurich Letters, p. 343
‡ M'Crie's Knox, vol. i. p. 390. § Burnet, vol. ii. p. 394.
‖ Burnet, vol. iii. p. 302; Strype, vol. i. p. 177.

principles; but, with heroic constancy, they maintained "that in order to the complete freeing of the church of Christ from the errors and corruptions of Rome, every usage and custom practised by that apostate and idolatrous church ought to be abolished; that all their ceremonies and circumstances ought to be clearly abrogated; and that the service of God ought to be simple, stript of all that pomp and appearance formerly used; esteeming all that to be no better than superstitions and antichristianism." This, our author adds, was "the commonly-received opinion" of the Reformers!*

The important facts now enumerated demand the most solemn consideration. The reader will probably regard these facts as furnishing ample and conclusive evidence that the Reformation, so much applauded in modern times, was stifled and unfinished. And do not these facts demonstrate that the efforts of the leading Reformers, after all their struggles, were lamentably defeated and borne down by potent and uncheeked political power? And was not this overruling power fraught with incalculable mischief, by obstructing and paralysing the Reformation? Though the church was rescued from papal despotism and cruelty, yet its reformation was interrupted and quashed, when very far from the character and freedom prescribed in the New Testament. The fatal error of this period, as the reader will perceive, was the assumption of power over the church of God,—the power of controlling man's belief, of coersing man's conscience, of prescribing man's prayers to his Maker, of silencing faithful ministers of Jesus Christ, of interrupting the spread of Christianity, of compelling all, ministers and people, to *uniformity* in religion! This stretch of arbitrary rule extended to "all spiritual and ecclesiastical persons," as well as to "all spiritual and ecclesiastical causes, within her Majesty's dominions:" but the reader must be aware that the queen and her bishops might as soon have extinguished the light of heaven as to have accomplished what they attempted. Though numerous measures were brought into operation to secure uniformity; yet, observes a learned churchman, "it is not in the wit or the power of man, or rather it is an *impossibility*, to prevent diversity of opinion; since this is the unavoidable result of human imperfection and human liberty."† Uniformity was absolutely

* Strype, vol. i. p. 177; Grindal, p. 28, 29; Burnet, vol. iii. p. 294.

† Jortin, vol. i. Pref.

unattainable; and the means employed were any thing but honourable to a protestant country. The church first truckled to the power of the state, then exercised ostentatious supremacy over the people.

The assumption of power, it will be recollected, was the fundamental error in the Romish system, from which all its monstrous absurdities originated: so the great evil attending the Reformation was the assumption, by the civil power, of that extraordinary prerogative, by which the churches, as in the days of Constantine, were governed by the laws of the state—not by the laws of Jesus Christ. These unrighteous measures invested the political head with the power of persecution, which was practically exhibited through a long series of years. It was, indeed, perfectly natural for Elizabeth, having no check, to imitate the tyrannizing ecclesiastic at Rome; whose lofty position she occupied, and whose power and authority her Majesty unhesitatingly claimed!*†

These statements cannot be charged with misrepresenting the royal intentions. They show the true position which her Majesty occupied in relation to ecclesiastical reform, and the course she pursued in conducting the affairs of the church. The reader will, therefore, easily discover the great error at the Reformation. That ecclesiastical change, instead of being adjusted in strict conformity to the word of God, was regulated by royal assumption and intolerant enactments—proceedings utterly repugnant to the nature and intentions of Christianity. The conductors of reform ought also to have recollected that the conscience, which is supreme in man, was not the property of the state, but the exclusive property of every member of the community; and that the people could neither surrender to others the *right*, nor give to others the *power*, to control their faith and religious practice, so long as God held every man responsible in all such matters. Every man must stand at the judgment-seat of Christ, to give an account of his *own* deeds; therefore, every man is under immuta-

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 260, 354. † When her Majesty's father, King Henry, rejected the papal authority, the parliament declared "that the Pope's power had no good foundation, and had been managed with much tyranny." But, if the Pope's power "had no good foundation," how could that of Elizabeth differ from it? And if the Pope exercised his power "with much tyranny," what security was there to prevent Elizabeth from doing the same, since she claimed similar power?—*Burnet*, vol. i. p. 143.

ble obligation to judge and choose for *himself,* in whatsoever pertains to faith, and worship, and salvation.

The Author of Christianity adopted a method of promoting his cause widely different from every scheme of human expediency; and his holy word furnished the only legitimate instructions for an entire reformation. The grand principle of separation from Rome was, that the Bible contained the religion of protestants; and that the holy Scriptures, enforcing religious doctrines and holy duties, constituted the only authority, as well as the only rule, of a just and complete reform. As it appeared impossible to ascertain either the nature or the extent of the reformation which God required, except by an exclusive appeal to the revelation He had given; so it seemed equally impossible to accomplish that reformation, except by a solemn recognition and direct observance of His holy administration. In conformity to this arrangement, God sent Christianity into the world, not to be measured out by the discretion of man, nor enforced by worldly sanctions, but to be sustained by its own high authority, and diffused in obedience to its own instructions. The common, but dangerous error was, that those in power had the entire regulation of these matters; and that all the rest of the community had only to accept at their hands, and as their bounty, that kind and portion of religion which they were pleased to administer: whereas Christianity was intended for the unexceptionable benefit of the poor and defenceless, as well as the rich and powerful; and no part of the human family could be restricted in the use of its benefits, without being robbed of the richest gift of God!

The highest authority has forbidden Christians to compromise their principles; but they are authorized to defend them on all proper occasions. On this honourable principle, the noble army of martyrs bled and died: but, admitting the lawfulness of human jurisdiction in concerns between man and his Maker, their principle was absurd, their piety fanaticism, their practice obstinacy, and their sufferings self-inflicted. If those in power may interpose by coercive jurisdiction in such concerns, where are they to stop? The admission of coercion in matters of faith and conscience would open a wide door to spiritual despotism, and also present formidable obstruction to the progress of Christianity. Had the affairs of

Christian churches been secured against human control, and Christianity been allowed to retain its unfettered and elevating influence, conferring its heavenly benefits upon the people, who can estimate the extent of good that would have followed, or the amount of misery that would have been prevented? If the churches had never extended beyond the limits of single congregations, as appointed by Jesus Christ, what racks and dungeons, what fires and fagots, what corruptions and crimes, what wars and persecutions, would have been prevented! The fact of the churches having retained their separate and distinctive character, as required in the New Testament, would have rendered the entire system of ecclesiastical legislation, with all the unrighteous deeds of antichrist, absolutely impossible!

The Lord Jesus founded Christian churches and their administration on a basis unimpeachable and imperishable: so that the only legitimate reformation was by adjusting all things according to his holy word; rescuing the churches from oppression and corruption, and restoring them to truth and freedom. Had the authors of reform rejected every other scheme as absolutely unwarrantable, and firmly adhered to the decisions of the word of God, the Reformation would have presented a character in holy conformity to the New Testament. By duly appreciating the instructions of inspired truth, the patrons of reform would have learned that Jesus Christ, the only head of the church, possessed "All power in heaven and in earth;" and that, by the exercise of regal Supremacy, he erected his spiritual kingdom in the world, displaying throughout an entire renunciation of external force. They would also have discovered that it was impossible to establish this kingdom by the policy and power of man, and only by the faithful administration appointed by Jesus Christ. The great Legislator of Christian churches sent his ministers, not to subjugate the world by the exercise of secular power, but, with unlimited authority, "to *teach* all nations."

It ought, moreover, to be recollected that coercion in religion was the contrivance of dark and barbarous times: but the Lord Jesus was so far from recommending force, that he commanded his apostles to *preach the gospel* as the only legitimate instrument of advancing his kingdom; and, in obedience to Him, they went

abroad among the nations to execute his will, persuading men to the obedience of faith. They were Heaven's ambassadors, commissioned to declare the will of their sovereign Lord; but they were prohibited from employing compulsory agency to enforce His doctrine: and it was at the awful peril of the highest power on earth to interfere with their message. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ; as though God did *beseech* you by us, we *pray* you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." "Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we *persuade* men." "Go ye into all the world, and *preach the gospel* to every creature." "*Teaching* them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." "Him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever He shall say unto you."

These sacred and immutable arrangements, which are too often overlooked, contain a specimen of the only instrumentality to be employed in this cause, which was carefully and successfully carried out by the apostles. With these gracious instructions and auspicious encouragements, they "went everywhere preaching the word," unshackled and unawed by man; being assured that no power on earth had authority to interfere with their ministry. The rulers, however, by grievous usurpation, committed the apostles to prison; and when commanded not to preach in the name of Jesus, they made this decisive appeal to their judges, before whom they stood, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, *judge ye;* for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." When released from prison, they were instantly "in the temple, teaching the people;" for which they were again arraigned, and interrogated, "Did not we straitly command you that you should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine:" but their unanswerable defence was, that they "ought to obey God rather than men."

The New Testament, as might be easily shown, furnishes ample illustration of this defence: and the Lord Jesus unalterably fixed the method of accomplishing the salvation of men; which the apostles, in obedience to his command, and by his blessing, carried into successful operation. Was it possible, then, for mortals to devise a scheme more effective than this—displaying greater wis-

dom and mercy? Could earthly rulers enforce their compulsory scheme, and with any degree of truth say it was more conformable to the gospel, or more suitable to the ministers of Christ, or better adapted to promote the salvation of men, than that which infinite wisdom not only appointed, but also conducted to achieve such important results? On the contrary, did not these sage rulers discover extreme want of sound principle by departing from the legislation of Jesus Christ, fostering ecclesiastical abuses, and inflicting heavy penalties for men's religious scruples? And would they not have prevented all these evils, and have secured to themselves lasting honour, if, instead of being governed by human policy, they had obeyed the instructions of the New Testament? These inquiries are submitted to the careful consideration of the reader.

The Roman usurpation shrouded the gospel in worse than midnight darkness; but the Reformers, who professedly rejected the papal authority, with its diversified errors, ought to have brought it to the light of day, replaced on the sole authority of its Founder, as the appointed instrumentality of preserving its purity, and of promoting its triumphs in the world. This, it is lamentable to add, was not done; but the Saviour's administration was strangely overlooked, and a system of expediency adopted. The government of Elizabeth, instead of adjusting all things according to the gospel, constituted other authority, diffused other principles, appointed other offices, devised other observances, required other duties, and denounced other punishments; it was therefore impossible to bring the Reformation to full maturity. The great Author of religion furnished sufficient evidence that the diffusion of Christianity was not entrusted to such instrumentality, but that he would have his cause promoted by that agency *alone* which He had appointed; and who dare arraign his conduct, or say unto him, "What doest thou?"

Queen Elizabeth and her council, with the foregoing authorized facts before their eyes, could scarcely believe that they were not required to obey the instructions given them; and they might with ease have ascertained that they were under indispensable obligation to carry out the Saviour's gracious intentions unaltered, and to the greatest possible extent. By suitable attention to His

holy administration, they would have rejected every other scheme as powerless and unwarrantable, and have gratefully bowed to observe what He prescribed. The authoritative instructions set before them were the contrivance of unerring wisdom, and the exhibitions of Divine mercy; so that whatsoever difficulties or objections might arise, they were permanently binding on them, as the only sound principles on which reformation could be based. The plan revealed to the churches constituted a perfect model of reform; and no one can doubt that it was intended to be observed, by rulers and people, to the end of the world. But, if the scheme thus appointed was the only legitimate one of effecting reform, why were the Saviour's merciful intentions so little regarded? Was not the scheme adopted a manifest deviation from His all-wise arrangement, and, consequently, obtrusive and unjust in His sight?

The removal of existing impediments to the spread of the gospel, and the guarantee of its unrestricted promulgation, seem, under Providence, to be the only safeguard against the return of popery, and the renewal of former cruelties. The founders of the Established Church constructed its laws, appointed its creeds, prescribed its prayers, enforced its observances, and furnished its very existence. But it was the church's misfortune that its constitution, laws, offices, courts, liturgy, and government, were alike unknown in the apostolic churches. Though the fact is seldom considered, yet it is remarkable that the apostles never make the least allusion to any of these peculiarities. Why, then, is it so frequently denominated the *apostolical* church? Are not all those peculiarities founded and established by the authority of the state? The whole fabric of the establishment was created and is sustained by state authority; and, if that authority were withdrawn, the establishment would of necessity cease to exist: but the reader is aware that such occurrence would have no effect on churches constituted according to the model presented in the New Testament.

The testimony of Dr. Whitgift, the great opponent of Mr. Cartwright, ought not to be omitted. This writer acknowledges the fact, which no intelligent person will dispute, that the apostolic churches claimed entire exemption, in all matters of religion, from the authority of earthly rulers; that "the state of the churches at

that time was popular;" that "most things in government were done by the consent of the people;" and that "princes did not meddle in causes ecclesiastical, except by persecution!" But, extraordinary as it may seem, the doctor affirms, that the modern church ought not to be "reduced to the form of government used in the apostles' times!"* This, surely, requires no comment. In the primitive churches, says a modern churchman, every particular church, in the management of its internal affairs, was essentially independent of every other institution; and the churches, thus constituted and regulated, formed a sort of federate body of independent communities, in affectionate harmony among themselves.† In this connexion the reader will doubtless be gratified with the sentiments of the learned Stillingfleet, afterward bishop, who observes, that it would be strange if the church should require more than Christ required, and make other conditions than those which the Saviour made. He could not conceive that any possible reason could be assigned for making the least alteration of the terms contained and prescribed in the New Testament. The learned doctor then asks, "What ground can there be why Christians should not stand on the same terms now as they did in the time of Christ and his apostles? What charter hath Christ given the church to bind men up to more than He hath done?"‡

Without attempting to reconcile the statements of these writers, we may observe, that Christian churches are Christ's own institutions, invested with holy properties, appointed for holy purposes, and governed by holy precepts and examples. We should, therefore, as soon think of making additions to the laws of the universe, as any addition to the regal administration of Jesus Christ. The former would not betray a greater degree of weakness than the latter; and it may be presumed that no intelligent person, uninfluenced by sinister views, will consider the multiplied ecclesiastical enactments as diminishing their enormity, especially as their protracted history furnishes such a melancholy picture! By mistaken, but fatal policy, those who framed the Anglican church substituted human expediency for apostolic authority; and, instead of inquiring, "What saith the Lord?" they inquired, "What saith the state?"

* Whitgift's Defence, p. 7, 132. † Waddington's Hist. p. 24.
‡ Stillingfleet's Irenicum, Pref.

Nor ought the fact to be overlooked that, when religion was enforced by compulsory authority, its glory, to the same extent, was obscured, and its progress retarded. Coercive measures not only crippled religious operation, and laid a frightful embargo on its success, but also offered a premium to conformity, generating formality and corruption. These unwise measures failed to appreciate the only elements of promoting the religion of Christ; the soil and the culture were alike uncongenial to its growth; and the history of the Established Church, during a trial of nearly three hundred years, furnishes sufficient amplification of the fact that God refused to honour expediency in the administration of his kingdom.

The Reformers, as we have seen, were sufficiently explicit in stating their principles and intentions, which, it is well known, are too often discarded and misrepresented; but this dishonourable practice may be left with those whose principles have no better defence. The assumption of power by restricting the spread of the gospel, or by exercising control over faith and conscience, never failed to obstruct the progress of religion and the salvation of souls! The Archbishop of Dublin unhesitatingly declares, that men employing compulsory power in this cause "cease to act on Christian principles."* Nevertheless, those who have been so long wedded to this practice, and have derived the profits of its corrupt operation, have found it so congenial to their taste that, like slave-holders, they have lost all impression of its enormity, and, of course, are unwilling to relinquish the nefarious assumption. It would seem, moreover, that many statesmen and others have very obscure views of the Reformation; and they have yet to learn, that the churches of Jesus Christ, with all their peculiarities, derive their existence, not from the state, but from the New Testament. Could earthly rulers be induced to understand this simple fact, and to adjust all things in conformity to it, they would, as legislators, keep within their own legitimate province, and allow the Son of God to govern his own kingdom. Had those in exalted stations pursued this course at the Reformation, and followed the instructions of inspired truth; had they left Christianity unfettered, and afforded every facility for its diffusion, they would only

* Whately's Kingdom of Christ, p. 42.

have discharged a duty they owed to God, and to the people: instead of which, by imperious restrictions, by heavy penalties, and by silencing multitudes of faithful ministers, they erected a formidable barrier against the progress of Christianity and the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom! Here was exemplified the saying, "Man compels—God persuades."

Queen Elizabeth, who was the sovereign mistress of the church, took the lead in these dishonourable restrictions. One instance may be placed on record. Her Majesty "declared herself offended at the number of preachers;" and, giving instructions to Archbishop Grindal, she said, "It was good to have *few* preachers in the church, and that *three* or *four* were sufficient for a county!" Her Majesty did not stop here, but commanded Grindal "to *abridge* the number of preachers, and to *put down* the religious exercises," even at a time when there was a lamentable scarcity of preaching ministers, and a great want of religious exercises! What kind of reformation was then to be expected with Elizabeth as its controlling head? But the venerable prelate "could not in conscience comply with her command." * †

The enlightened Reformers, who were among the noblest benefactors of their race, and who derived their principles from the Bible, satisfactorily ascertained that Jesus Christ was the sole founder and governor of his churches, and that his authority constituted the only just, and honourable, and efficient principle of the Reformation. No power on earth could impugn their principles; and had they been as able as they were desirous to have carried out these sacred principles, the Reformation would have attained that maturity which is required in the word of God. The reader will perceive, that the arrangements of Jesus Christ and his apostles demanded an entire reform of ecclesiastical jurisprudence—extinguishing the fires which persecution had kindled—blotting from

* Strype's Grindal, p. 221. † How different were the sentiments of Bishop Hooper from those of Queen Elizabeth! It is recorded of this devoted prelate that he preached once or twice every day! He said, "I cannot but wonder at the opinion of those who say, 'One sermon in a week, or a month, or a quarter of a year, is sufficient for the people.' Is one sermon every day too much for a godly bishop and evangelical preacher? My faith is, that both master and servant shall find gain at the year's end by hearing sermon and prayers every day in the week!"—*Prynne's Histrio-Mastix*, p. 531.

the statute-book every law compelling religious observances—abolishing all forced contributions for the maintenance of religion—securing equal protection to every kind of religious faith—and disallowing human authority from being directed against any department of religious profession. These happy arrangements would have banished the intruder between God and conscience—invited the Saviour to occupy his supremacy and his throne—rescued Christianity from bondage and corruption—secured to Christian churches the unmolested exercise of faith and intercourse with God—perfected the great work of reformation—and administered supreme gratification to every enlightened protestant. The shocking scenes of persecution would have been superseded, since no one could have possessed power to persecute—the gospel of Christ would have been released from political thraldom, and allowed unrestricted operation among the people—the honour of the throne, the stability of the government, the happiness of the community, and the eternal welfare of all ranks and all classes, would have been more extensively promoted. This achievement, closely connected with the Saviour's mission, would have secured peace and good-will among men, and excited unmingled thanksgiving unto God.

PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY.

MEMOIR

OF

THOMAS CARTWRIGHT.

CHAPTER I.

BIRTH AND EARLY HISTORY.

Thomas Cartwright was born about the year 1535, in the county of Hertford; but the place of his birth is not recorded. His parents were in reputable, though not in wealthy circumstances; but, perceiving that their son possessed brilliant talents, and ardently thirsted after literary acquirements, they encouraged his leading propensity, and appointed him to the exercises of the muses. His progress in school-learning was rapid and extensive; and high expectations were entertained by his friends, who anticipated his becoming eminent in future life. The custom of those times was to send to college at an early age such youths as were intended for learned professions. Sir William Cecil, afterward the celebrated Lord Burghley,* entered the university at fifteen. At the same age, Mr. Cartwright was sent to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he was placed first under the tuition of Dr. Bill, then after him under Mr. Thomas Lever, a celebrated Reformer, who continued master of the college so long as he could retain the office without the sacrifice of conscience.

* The name of Burghley will frequently occur, the original spelling of which, as adopted by himself, is invariably retained.

In this happy seclusion, surrounded with the literature of the time, our young collegian had a wide field for the exercise of his mental endowments, and, by assiduous attention to study, he made reputable proficiency in the various branches of useful literature. From the commencement of his academical pursuits, he formed the habit of intense application, to which he adhered all the rest of his days, and allowed himself only *five hours* for sleep through the subsequent stages of life.

All human affairs are liable to calamity and disappointment; the truth of which Mr. Cartwright found by painful experience. Having enjoyed and appreciated the advantages of the university about three years, he was interrupted by one of those events which no human eye could foresee nor human power control. In consequence of the revolution in the ecclesiastical establishment by the death of King Edward, he was forced from the university by intolerance, and, being willing to forego all the advantages of literary improvement rather than defile his conscience by a compliance with the errors and superstitions of popery, he, without hesitation, forsook the university, and engaged in the office of clerk to a counsellor-at-law. This was doubtless to him a very painful dispensation; but, at so early a period, it reflected great honour on the soundness of his principles and the piety of his character, by which his adherence to protestantism endured so severe a test.

St. John's College was highly favoured by Mr. Lever, who occupied the mastership, and was the most flourishing college in the university, both for sound religion and useful literature. By his judicious government and worthy example, the Reformation made considerable progress, being maintained with great zeal and perseverance; and, on the accession of Queen Mary, the master and twenty-four fellows, with other scholars, one of whom was Mr. Cartwright, sacrificed their places and promotions rather than the testimony of their consciences, refusing conformity to popish corruptions.* Mary's accession not only overturned the Reformation so vigorously commenced under King Edward, but also restored the entire system of popery, with all its frightful cruelties. This was a mournful dispensation to the Reformers, which caused great numbers to retire into seclusions in the country, and many

* Baker's MSS. vol. i. p. 149, 150.

others sought refuge in a foreign land, while several hundreds were cast into prison and carried to the stake!

Mr. Cartwright was deeply affected to witness these heart-rending tragedies, and burning men for their religion filled the land with dismay; but an indulgent Providence watched over him, and preserved him from the fire. Being placed beyond the discovery of suspicion, he moved in a new sphere, and directed his attention to fresh pursuits; but his employment under the counsellor did not entirely prevent him from prosecuting his favourite studies. To be deprived of the means of literary improvement was to him a source of unspeakable regret; but he still devoted considerable attention to the study of divinity, as well as to those branches of literature which were more immediately calculated for usefulness to a divine. We are also reminded that, from his legal pursuits at this period, he obtained no inconsiderable knowledge of the law, by which he was afterward enabled "to fence the better for himself."*

During the tragedies of this reign, Mr. Cartwright remained in this situation, and till the accession of Queen Elizabeth, which introduced a counter-revolution in the ecclesiastical establishment, from popery to protestantism. This eventful æra, ever to be held in grateful remembrance, gladdened the hearts of all the friends of sound religion and Christian freedom. The Reformers who had fled from persecution with joy returned home; and those who had retired to places of seclusion came forth, in expectation of better and happier times. On this important change, Dr. James Pilkington, who was chosen master of St. John's College, and afterward the worthy Bishop of Durham,† contracted an acquaintance with Mr. Cartwright, and with his literary attainments, accompanied by strong recommendation from the gentleman whom he had served in the law. This excellent prelate is styled "a zealous puritan, out of whose school proceeded Cartwright and others." If this be correct, he certainly managed matters more dexterously than many other puritans, who were deprived and cast into prison; but Dr. Pilkington was raised to a bishopric, which he enjoyed sixteen years, till his death.‡ He was doubtless a constant patron of religion and the freedom of conscience.

* Fuller's Worthies, part ii. p. 27. † Wood, vol. i. p. 590. ‡ Dyer's Hist. vol. ii. p. 240.

The learned master having obtained an interview with Mr. Cartwright, and having ascertained his abilities and acquirements, offered to introduce him again to St. John's College; to which he readily consented, and with delight resumed his former studies. It may be added, that his assiduity and improvement far surpassed the expectations of his patron. He was placed under the guardianship of Mr. Dudley Fenner, a divine of great eminence, and at that time a celebrated tutor in the University of Cambridge; and it soon appeared that the scholar was no disgrace to either his patron or his tutor. The year after his re-admission, he was chosen fellow of the house; but in three years he removed to Trinity College, where, for his attainments in piety and literature, he was elected one of the senior fellows.*

The sphere in which Mr. Cartwright now moved was smooth, and congenial to his wishes; and he made rapid and extensive progress in literary knowledge. In the year 1564, Queen Elizabeth honoured the university with a royal visit, when magnificent preparations were adopted for her entertainment, and the principal scholars were selected for the public disputations in the presence of her Majesty. The queen was entertained during the day with scholastic exercises in philosophy, physic, and divinity; and, at night, diverted with comedies and tragedies. Among the disputants selected on this occasion was Mr. Cartwright, who, in the royal presence, discovered those distinguished abilities which gave entire satisfaction to her Majesty and other auditors.† The story of Mr. Cartwright having made suit to be one of the disputants before her Majesty is scarcely worthy of a passing notice,‡ seeing the fact on record is, that he was chosen to this service by those who had the appointment; and it is observed, on the authority of Mr. Strype, that the ripest and most learned men were *selected* for the disputants, and Mr. Cartwright, being one of that number, appears to have greatly distinguished himself on this occasion.§ He took a leading part in the philosophy act, on the third day of the royal visit, when these two political questions were discussed:— "Is monarchy the most eligible kind of government?" "Is the frequent change of laws dangerous?" The learned opponents

* Clark's Lives, p. 16, 17. † Ibid. p. 17. ‡ Dugdale's Warwick. vol. i. p. 443.
§ Chalmers, vol. viii. p. 323.

were, first Mr. Cartwright, then Dr. Chadderton, Dr. Preston, and Mr. Clerk.

Her Majesty on this occasion took her leave of the university, by the delivery of a Latin oration, addressed to the learned collegians. This was an exhibition never witnessed in that seat of learning before nor since: a virgin queen before a body of venerable scholars and divines, addressing them in the language of a scholar, but with the tone of a sovereign. She said, among other things:—"PRINCIPUM DICTA LEGUM AUCTORITATEM APUD SUBDITOS RETINENT." *The words of Princes have the authority of laws with their subjects!*

Fuller remarks that all persons were pleased with the royal visit:* but a modern author affirms, that he was sure, and subsequent events proved, that they could not be all pleased; and no English university, he trusted, would now be pleased to be dictated to in the very language of the civil law by an English queen, however learned. The catholics were not pleased; the puritans could not be pleased; and many of the university, who wore the smile of approbation, were surely not inwardly pleased.†

This was an occurrence not to be forgotten in the university; and certain authors have observed that, while the other disputants were applauded and rewarded by the royal visitor, Mr. Cartwright was slighted and neglected; and that Preston, by comely gesture and a pleasing pronunciation, was both esteemed and rewarded by her Majesty: but that our scholar received neither reward nor commendation; also that he was presumptuous of his learning, and ungraceful in his elocution. One author affirms, that he was "unhewn and awkward both in his person and manners;" and another, who styles him "the great father of puritanism," a person of "some eminence" but "great ambition," that the queen "more critically approved of the lighter elegances in which the grave Cartwright was deficient." ‡ It was to be expected that those who did not relish his principles would represent him as exceedingly disconcerted and mortified by the supposed slight cast upon him; and they even affirmed that he began immediately to wade into divers opinions concerning church discipline, and to despise the

* Fuller's Cam. p. 137—139. † Dyer's Hist. vol. i. p. 96, 97.
‡ Biog. Brit. vol. vii. p. 4235; D'Israeli's Charles I. vol. iii. p. 237.

government of the Established Church, growing conceited of his learning and holiness, and a great contemner of those who differed from him!*

As this account throws a considerable shade on Mr. Cartwright's memory, it will not be improper to bring it to the test of examination, and, if possible, to find the truth. The author last cited, it is well known, wrote a panegyric, rather than a biography of Archbishop Whitgift; and, because Whitgift was a determined enemy to Mr. Cartwright, he endeavoured throughout his narrative to magnify the character of his hero by perpetually depreciating the contrary party, betraying extreme partiality. The paltry aspersion, without one particle of evidence, has been echoed from adversary to adversary, till effrontery itself is abashed and put to confusion; but the tale so often told is contrary to the clearest evidence. This we learn from unexceptionable testimony. The reader has already seen that Mr. Cartwright gave entire satisfaction to his exalted auditors; he could not, therefore, be mortified for being unnoticed. We are also reminded that the followers of Mr. Cartwright ascribed his future nonconformity to his conscience, not to any personal discontent; and that they gave no credit to the story propagated by his enemies, but they believed that the queen highly commended, though she did not reward him.† Who then were most deserving of credit—inveterate enemies or decided friends? If we pay a due regard to justice, we shall doubtless pronounce a more equitable sentence on Mr. Cartwright than that of the author whose testimony is so much calculated to mislead the reader. But who can imagine that a man, so famous for learning and piety, would plunge himself into so many troubles from so trivial a cause? Is it not also very improbable that the politic queen, who employed every possible art to secure the favour of all her subjects, would disoblige a learned man in the university by denying him the praise he deserved, especially at a time when she was striving to ingratiate the university and the nation? No one acquainted with the subject will deny that Mr. Cartwright was a learned man, or that he was not far superior to Preston in literary attainments. We are reminded that Mr. Cartwright dealt most with the muses; but Preston with the graces. The former disputed like a great man;

* Paule's Whitgift, p. 9, 10. † Fuller's Cam. p. 139.

the latter like a genteel scholar.* On supposition that her Majesty did not commend but despise him, who can imagine that a man in his circumstances would be so much disturbed with so mere a trifle? Had he been a courtier, aspiring after preferment, there would certainly have been greater plausibility in the story; but academics, especially those of "natural roughness," do not usually make much account of the judgment of a woman.

It is somewhat gratifying, however, to be able to reflect additional light on this subject. From the original document, furnishing a particular account of her Majesty's reception at Cambridge, it is most obvious that there was no cause of discontent whatever, as here stated in the words of the historian. "Reports have commonly been spread that the cause of Cartwright's setting himself openly against the hierarchy, as he did soon after, was from a disgust he took at this time, as though the queen showed more countenance to the other disputants than to him. But, by the *relation* of the queen's reception at Cambridge, there appears no clear ground for any such discontent. For the queen is there said to have *approved them all;* only that Preston pleased her *most,* and was made her scholar, with the settlement of an annual salary, and was allowed to kiss her Majesty's hand."†

This occurrence requires no further comment. But the partial biographer of Whitgift treats the memory of Mr. Cartwright with unmeasured and disgusting severity. He unhesitatingly declares, not only that he poured contempt upon all men, even the most learned and worthy who differed from him, but that he had the highest esteem for those who espoused his sentiments, though of the meanest learning and the basest character! This abusive writer also affirms that Mr. Cartwright, to feed his humour with his conceited novelties, travelled to Geneva, where, observing the government and discipline of the church by certain ecclesiastical superintendents and presbyters, his affection was so far carried away with the new discipline, that he thought all churches and congregations ought to be squared by the practice of Geneva. He adds, that Mr. Cartwright took exceptions against the Established Church, disallowing the vocation of archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers, the administration of the holy sacraments,

* Peck's Desid. vol. i. p. 138. † Strype, vol. i. p. 446, 447.

and observation of rites and ceremonies, and, instilling these conceits into the heads of the preachers and scholars of the university, he drew a great number of disciples after him; and that he and his adherents, having delivered three sermons in the college chapel on one Lord's-day, spoke so vehemently against the ceremonies, especially the use of the surplice, that nearly all the collegians cast off their surplices, and appeared in the chapel without them.*

It may not be improper to furnish another specimen of censure, from an historian of the same school, who fearlessly states that the neglect with which her Majesty treated Mr. Cartwright so deeply afflicted his proud spirit that, in a sudden gust of humour, he retired from the university, and set up his studies at Geneva, where he became as great with Beza, and the rest of that consistory, as ever Knox had been with Calvin. As soon also as he had become well acquainted with the form of their discipline, and studied all such points as were to be reduced to practice, being well stored with principles, and furnished with instructions, he prepared for England, and again put himself into his college.† It is observed by a modern writer, not less remarkable for incorrectness, that Mr. Cartwright "expatriated himself several years, and returned from Calvin endowed with a full portion of *his revolutionary spirit!*"‡ But Calvin was dead; how then could this be true? The reader will doubtless consider this silly statement, as well as the foregoing, not only as intended to reproach the memory of the two divines, but also as opposed to the entire history both of Calvin and Cartwright.

If any credit be due to the author of the Life of Mr. Cartwright, he did not visit Geneva at the time these writers pretend, nor is there the least evidence of his visiting Geneva at this period; so that their testimony is, to say the least, extremely doubtful. § Nor does it appear that Mr. Cartwright went abroad till after he was deprived of employment at home; and it is certain that he obtained considerable preferment, even *six years* after the queen's visit to Cambridge: from which it obviously appears how little he was disconcerted, and how high was his reputation in the university; also how small a portion of credit is due to these writers. If his mind

* Paul's Whitgift, p. 10—12.
† Heylin's Pres. p. 262.
‡ D'Israeli's Charles I. vol. iii. p. 237.
§ Clark, p. 17.

had been disturbed by any indication of disgrace, as these and other writers have insinuated,* the honour which the university conferred upon him, in choosing him to so respectable a professorship, would, no doubt, have sufficiently pacified him. And if it were admitted that Queen Elizabeth had so low an opinion of his learning and abilities when she visited the university, her Majesty had undoubtedly sufficient reason afterward for detecting her mistake, and changing her opinion.

Mr. Cartwright is accused of having embraced Calvinistic doctrines at Geneva; but of whom could he learn them? Who at Geneva was likely to exasperate his mind against the Established Church? Calvin was dead. Who then was to instruct him but the learned Beza, the principal person in their church and university? with whom, from their first acquaintance, Mr. Cartwright lived on terms of most intimate friendship. This will not be considered as disreputable to either. They had the highest opinion of each other's piety, abilities, and literary attainments; so that Mr. Cartwright's familiar intercourse with so distinguished a man could operate only to his benefit.

The subject of this memoir, being a decided enemy to corruption, took an active part with the seniors of the college in correcting certain abuses in the election of scholars. These abuses were founded on precedent, but contrary to existing statutes, particularly those which related to the appointment of Westminster scholars to that house. Dr. Bill had received supernumeraries until places should become void; but to this the masters and fellows replied, that no precedent could oblige them to act contrary to the statute. When it was pleaded that Dr. Bill had recommended these kind of admissions, they showed that there had been a time when the doctor admitted one scholar and no more, according to statute.

To obtain redress of these irregularities, the seniors of the college transmitted an account of these abuses to Sir William Cecil, chancellor of the university, declaring that they were extremely injurious to study, and that they cut off nearly all hope of the scholars making progress in learning. They reminded the chancellor that there were many in the college of good learning and

* Echard, p. 334; Chalmers, vol. viii. p. 326.

ingenuity, who, having no hope of reward, were forced to depart from the college for want of maintenance; or, if they continued, being discouraged, they grew slack in their studies, having no prospect of reward, but beheld young scholars newly come from the grammar-school rewarded before them. They also complained that they had not the power of rewarding worthy students according to their deserts, but were forced sometimes to prefer the unworthy to those who were most elegible and deserving; and, having stated other inconveniences attending these elections, they importuned the worthy chancellor to obtain their deliverance from these painful embarrassments. This application was subscribed by Whitgift, Cartwright, and others, all ardently seeking reformation. Their efforts proved successful, and the desired improvements were adopted.*

The heads of houses, one of whom was Dr. Whitgift, were less successful on another important occasion. Instead of the Reformation being carried to full maturity, the heads were filled with alarming apprehensions for the purity of religion and the freedom of the university by a return to popish customs and the enforcement of the popish habits; they, therefore, presented their united petition to the chancellor, dated November 26, 1565, earnestly soliciting him, if possible, to stay the proceeding, which, in their opinion, would be most prejudicial to the university.

"A report has reached us, that for the future all scholars of this university will be forced to return to the old popish habits. This is daily mentioned to us by a great multitude of pious and learned men, who affirm in their consciences that they think every ornament of this kind is unlawful; and, if the intended proclamation is enforced, they will be brought into the greatest danger. Lest our university should be forsaken, we think it is one of our first duties to acquaint you with this condition of ourselves and our brethren. And by these letters we most humbly beg, as well from your wisdom as from your credit and favour with the queen's Majesty, that you would intercede with her to withhold a proclamation of this kind. For, as far as we can see, there can be no danger or inconvenience in exempting us from this burden; but, on the contrary, we very much fear that it will prove a hinderance to the preaching

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 14.

of the gospel and to literature. By your successful application to this, you will no doubt confer a great benefit not only on us, but on the *nation at large.*"*

This unpropitious effort gave so great offence at court that it was instantly "quashed;" and Dr. Whitgift, then a zealous Reformer, who took an active part in promoting it, was presently induced to repent of what he had done, and renounce his reform principles. Having become an apt scholar in the science of courtiers, he not only turned about, and made an humiliating "apology" for this inauspicious petition,† but also found far more powerful attractions in hoods and surplices than he had previously conceived; nor did he stop here, but henceforth he became a violent persecutor of the cause which he had so openly espoused and patronized!

The enforcement of conformity was also prompt and decisive in the metropolis. Archbishop Parker, having sought the assistance of the council, and convened the London ministers at Lambeth, sternly demanding conformity, sixty-one promised to conform, but thirty-seven refused, who, his grace observed, "were the best" of them. These were immediately suspended from their ministry, and, having the fruits sequestered, were threatened to be deprived of their benefices, if they did not conform in three months; yet, said the archbishop, they behaved with "great modesty and quietness." The venerable primate had previously anticipated that "very many churches would be deprived of their pastors, and that many would forsake their livings," as the unhappy consequence of these severe measures.‡ Great was the sorrow and lamentation of these holy sufferers, who exclaimed, "We are killed in our souls by this pollution: we cannot perform our ministry in the singleness of our hearts." Under these extreme hardships, some betook themselves to secular occupations, and others were cast into prison; yet the archbishop had no doubt that they "were moved by conscience!"§ Notwithstanding these facts, the late Dr. Southey declares that Elizabeth's government "carried on no war against conscience," but was conducted on the principle, "that conscience is not to be constrained, but won by the force of truth, with the aid

* Strype's Parker, Appen. p. 69.
† Strype's Whitgift, p. 9.
‡ Lansdowne MSS. vol. viii. art. 86, ix. 35.
§ Strype's Grindal, p. 98, 99.

of time, and use of all good means of persuasion!"* We shall not attempt to reconcile the Primate and the Poet Laureate.

In the year 1567, Mr. Cartwright took his bachelor's degree, and two years after was chosen Lady Margaret's professor of divinity. This professorship was founded in the reign of Henry VII., and is enumerated among the principal events of that period. A license was granted to Lady Margaret, countess of Richmond, and mother of the king, for a perpetual lectureship in theology. In addition to other regulations, the Abbot of Westminster, or the Abbot of Barwell, was appointed to pay the stipend for the lecture.† Mr. Cartwright succeeded Dr. William Chadderton, successively Bishop of Chester and Lincoln;‡ and in the office of professor, he delivered lectures on the first two chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, in which he displayed that power of intellect, that solidity of judgment, and that eminent degree of learning and piety which excited the highest admiration and applause. His lectures drew together crowds of admiring auditors; and his pulpit exercises were so much followed that, when he preached at St. Mary's Church, the windows of the church were taken down for the accommodation of the multitudes who flocked to hear him.§

Mr. Cartwright refused to patronize superstitious observances, and took occasion to deliver his sentiments on the discipline of the church of Christ, which the early Reformers had been so desirous to promote; but, his views not being in accordance with those of the ruling ecclesiastics, a storm of opposition was raised against him, especially by Dr. Whitgift. His biographer reminds us that what Mr. Cartwright delivered in his sermon one Lord's-day, Whitgift always refuted in the same place the Lord's-day following, to his high commendation and applause.‖ How far this promoted the reputation of his character, it is unnecessary to inquire; but it will be difficult, not to say impossible, to reconcile Whitgift's practice, on this occasion, with his conduct when he silenced the learned Mr. Travers for doing the same thing.¶

Dr. Whitgift, it is said, answered Mr. Cartwright's sermons from the pulpit, with "very great strength of argument." If he

* Book of the Church, vol. ii. p. 291, 449.
† Dyer's Hist. vol. i. p. 81.
‡ Strype's Whitgift, p. 11.
§ Clark, p. 17.
‖ Paule's Whitgift, p. 13.
¶ Fuller, b. ix. p. 217.

did, he employed stronger arguments in preaching than in writing, as will appear in the sequel of the narrative. Mr. Cartwright had a considerable portion of the university in his favour, among whom were men of eminence, who, admiring him and his principles, espoused his cause.* A writer of Whitgift's principles, stating his judgment of the two disputants, says, "The result of their difference was that, if Cartwright had the better of it in *learning*, Whitgift had the advantage in *temper;* and he had more *power* to back, if fewer people to follow him."†

Mr. Cartwright, in his public lectures, discussed the abuses in the church, but in the most peaceable and respectful manner; and where was the evil of this? Was it not equally honourable in him, as it was in Reformers of an earlier period, to lay open existing corruptions? All churchmen, in the days of King Edward, considered this a duty which they owed to God, and a practice highly commendable and useful. Why then should similar conduct be grievously censured in the reign of Elizabeth? Were the errors of popery to be detected and reformed, but the popish corruptions, intermixed with protestantism, to pass unreformed and unnoticed? Unless abuses had been exposed in the sermons and writings of learned men, how could they have been sufficiently known, or whence detected and removed? The continental Reformers, as already stated, recommended the reforming ministers to submit to the ecclesiastical impositions for a time, till they could be removed; but they never dissuaded from speaking against them: on the contrary, they exhorted all persons to use their utmost efforts, publicly and privately, to get them abolished. Nor could there be any sufficient reason for blaming Mr. Cartwright, or any other minister, for discharging a duty he owed to God and his church, to conscience and his country.

On this interesting principle our divine acted in perfect agreement with his brother Reformers, maintaining with scrupulous firmness that it was every man's indispensable duty to promote reform, according to the particular station he occupied in society. The noble principle on which he acted is thus expressed: "When I say according to his particular station, I mean that a magistrate by his authority, a minister by his preaching, and all by their

* Chalmers, vol. viii. p. 323. † Fuller's Cam. p. 141.

prayers, ought to further it."* This just and honourable principle on which he conducted his lectures was deserving of universal commendation; and we are persuaded that no true protestant will censure him for aiding the great and good work, according to the station in which God had placed him.

The principles of church reform having spread rapidly and extensively, were favourably received through the country, but especially in the two universities. The fellows and scholars of St. John's College, to the number of nearly three hundred, threw off their surplices with one consent; and many in the other colleges followed their example.† The clergy in the city of London, with those in other places, objected to the popish superstitions, and refused to wear the square cap, the tippit, and the surplice. Thus they trod in the steps of their learned predecessors; and our author adds, "It is marvellous how much these habits were abhorred by many honest, well-meaning men, who styled them anti-christian, and by no means fit to be used in a reformed Christian church."‡

These devoted servants of God were great sufferers in this cause; yet they bore with becoming fortitude the accumulated hardships laid upon them, and undismayed they sought to advance the Reformation according to the word of God. They used unexceptionable means, and employed most commendable efforts for the attainment of this important object; yet they suffered cruel mockings, bonds, and imprisonments, rather than renounce their principles or relinquish an object so near their hearts; and, notwithstanding their mortifying disappointment, they continued in this honourable struggle, ever aiming to obtain greater purity and freedom in the church of God. The country had not long emerged from popish darkness and superstition; and the progress of the Reformation, as already shown, was thwarted and interrupted presently after its commencement, while the zealous Reformers were maligned and persecuted. Their holy principles, as well as the great object they sought to accomplish, claimed high commendation from every enlightened protestant, and laid a foundation for the purity and prosperity of the churches of Jesus Christ.

* Pierce, part i. p. 77. † Strype, vol. i. p. 473. ‡ Strype's Parker, p. 151.

CHAPTER II.

EXPULSION FROM THE UNIVERSITY.

Mr. Cartwright possessed a noble and generous spirit, disclaimed all solicitude for human applause and worldly promotion, and showed the liberality and benevolence of his principles by an unreserved diffusion of the truth of God. With painful sensations he beheld the numerous Romish relics and degrading superstitions retained in the Established Church, and, in accordance with the spirit and principles of the best Reformers, he sought the purification of the church and the advancement of the kingdom of Christ. Unbiassed by party prejudice and worldly interest, his untiring love to God and unfailing concern for the welfare of souls stimulated him to make known to others whatsoever appeared to be agreeable to the word of God.

On these honourable principles he conducted his theological lectures in the university. His sole object was to promote the cause of truth and righteousness, and, with his usual honesty and frankness, he declared his sentiments on points of church discipline, then so generally neglected; but because his opinions were not conformable to the spirit of the hierarchy, and because he endeavoured to promote reformation faster and to greater extent than was agreeable to those in power, charges were exhibited against him by Dr. Chadderton, his predecessor in the Margaret Professorship, who accused him to Sir William Cecil, the chancellor,—That he taught there was, in the Church of England, no lawful calling or choosing of ministers; that the election of ministers and bishops was tyrannical; that archbishops, deans, and archdeacons were officers and names of impiety; and that this doctrine was pernicious and intolerable in a Christian common-

wealth. The doctor, having complained of one or two other puritan divines, earnestly solicited the chancellor to consider how much the church would be endangered if these persons were allowed "to publish their opinions!" He therefore warmly recommended the exercise of "severe authority," and the suppression, by *force*, of these "seditious contentions, errors, and schisms," as he stigmatized them; without which, he said, "the good state and government of the university, and of the church and realm," were in imminent danger!*

All persons acquainted with history are aware that, in every age, the self-interested have severely censured the best of men, as well as the best of principles, especially when they have tended to expose and amend existing abuses. Admitting the doctor's statement to have been unexceptionably correct, these two or three ministers of Christ, delivering their religious opinions, must, on the one hand, have been very formidable creatures; or, on the other, the university and the church, yea the *realm*, must have rested on very sandy foundations! Were these two or three stigmatized Reformers then endowed with so large a portion of truth, and influence, and power, as to endanger the overthrow of both church and state? or must we conclude that these were slanderous statements, intended to degrade their character and render them odious to the chancellor?

The doctrines which Mr. Cartwright delivered are styled "novel doctrines;"† but to prevent the universal wreck so much dreaded, he was convened before the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges, who at first were not quite so zealous as the reverend accuser. They did not adopt any prompt and decisive measures, nor "proceed so roundly" as some persons deemed necessary; and this dilatoriness generated no small degree of dissatisfaction in the breasts of warm-hearted churchmen. Mr. Cartwright was to be refuted by "other means" than as heretofore by the preaching of Dr. Whitgift; and, strange as it may appear, the iron arm of power was employed to refute his statements and to stem the progress of his opinions!

Archbishop Grindal, who united in these pressing measures, had declared his wish that all persons belonging to the French and

* Strype, vol. i. p. 623, 624. † D'Israeli's Charles I. vol. iii. p. 237.

Dutch nations, who did not unite themselves to the French or Dutch church in London, or did not orderly resort to the parish church where they resided, should be commanded to depart the realm within twenty days.* The prelate had already been concerned in the examination and commitment of upwards of thirty persons, denominated "separatists," who remained in prison a whole year, as a punishment for their supposed errors in religion; but Grindal, at length, obtained their release.† By this severe discipline they were not induced to renounce their principles. Grindal, therefore, recommended the Lords of the Council to renew these severities. "My opinion is," said he, "that all the heads of this unhappy faction should be with all expedition severely punished, to the example of others, as people *fanatical* and *incurable!* which punishment, if it proceed by order from your lordships, shall breed the greater terror. And in my opinion, under your lordship's correction, it were not amiss that six of the most desperate of them should be sent to the common gaol of Cambridge, and six likewise to Oxford, and some others of them to other gaols hereabouts, as to your wisdoms shall be thought expedient!"‡

The learned Zanchius, at this trying crisis, addressed a letter to Grindal; in which, after having forcibly stated a number of points which the puritans wished to see reformed in the Established Church, he added, "I respect and venerate the men on either side for their piety, learning, and authority, although differing in opinion among themselves. I do not interpose my judgment in these matters. If, in my narration, any thing seems to preponderate in favour of one side or other, you will reckon that to be intended for the fuller explication of the matter, not for an indulgence of a party spirit. I am induced to write these things not by way of bias of mind, but by a sense of duty." He then furnished very seasonable advice. "The bishops," said he, "should be stirred up by letter to persuade the queen's Majesty, by all convenient methods, to amend those things which breed offences, and hinder the course of the gospel; and also, if they cannot obtain all they wish, that in inflicting penalties upon their brethren and fellow-ministers, especially those whose consciences are heavily burdened, they

* Grindal's Remains, p. 297. † Strype's Grindal, p. 136.
‡ Grindal's Remains, p. 319.

would be somewhat more gentle and more disposed to toleration."*

This seasonable and important advice, it would seem, was lost on the venerable prelate, who expressed warm disapprobation of the gentle and tardy proceedings of the university against Mr. Cartwright. Grindal had indeed bemoaned the imperfect state of the Reformation, and, as already stated, had made known his conscientious scruples against those things which were required of bishops. But the venerable prelate interfered with the affairs of the university, and addressed a letter to the chancellor, dated June 24, 1570, complaining of the tardiness of the university, and urging the persecution of Mr. Cartwright. In this uncatholic measure, he very officiously, and without provocation, interfered in matters not belonging to his jurisdiction, which will best appear from the document here inserted:—

"I am to move you for the university of Cambridge, which, if you help not speedily, your authority will shortly grow to great disorder. There is one Cartwright, Bachelor of Divinity, and reader of my Lady Margaret's divinity lecture, who, as I am very credibly informed, maketh in his lectures daily invectives against the external policy and distinction of states in the ecclesiastical government of this realm. His own positions, and some other assertions which have been uttered by him, I send herewith. The youth of the university, who are at this time very toward in learning, frequent his lectures in great numbers, and therefore are in danger of being poisoned by him with love of contention and liking of novelties, and so becoming hereafter not only unprofitable, but also hurtful to the church.

"The vice-chancellor and heads of houses proceed not so *roundly* in this case as were in my opinion requisite! For the reforming of which, if it please you to know my opinion, I wish you to write your letters to the vice-chancellor with *expedition,* willing him to command the said Cartwright and all his adherents to *silence,* both in schools and pulpits! and afterward, upon examining and hearing the matters past, before him and some of the heads, or all, either to reduce the offenders to conformity, or to proceed to their punishment, by *expulsion* out of their colleges, or out of the

* Grindal's Remains, p. 342.

university, as the cause shall require! And also that the vice-chancellor do not suffer the said Cartwright to proceed Doctor of Divinity at this commencement, which he now sueth for! For, besides the singularity above rehearsed, the said Cartwright is not conformable in *apparel*, contemning also many other laudable orders of the university! Thus I cease to trouble you, and commend you heartily to the grace of God."*

Grindal did not stop here. On the same subject, he presently addressed another epistle to Chancellor Cecil, in which he said, "My opinion is, as I have written to you before, that they, 'the puritans,' are only to be bridled by authority; and, if they do not revoke their factious assertions, let them be expelled the university, for terror to others. And although Cartwright would revoke his opinions, he is never to be permitted to read again in the university; for he hath a busy head, stuffed full of singularities!"†

Notwithstanding these heavy complaints, Mr. Cartwright uttered no sedition, raised no tumult, promoted no disorder, created no schism; and, if these evils existed at all in the university, they were created by others, and not by him: he only sought, in the most peaceable and honourable manner, what Grindal and other prelates had formerly sought, but could not obtain—a purer reformation of the church. Grindal was a man of eminent learning and piety, showing greater moderation than many others, especially towards the close of life; but it may be questioned whether he did not, in this instance, overstep the bounds of Christian decorum, and discover a portion of that intolerance of which many of the right reverend fathers were fearfully guilty. It may also be presumed, that Grindal, when he made the above application, had forgotten those just and honourable sentiments which, before his promotion, he had published to the world: "He manifestly laid open and taught all men not to measure religion by custom, but try custom by the truth and word of God. Custom may soon deceive, but the word of God abideth for ever."‡ These important avowals were highly reputable to the venerable author, who might have said that they constituted the only honourable basis of the protestant Reformation.

* Strype's Grindal, p. 162; Grindal's Remains, p. 323. † Grindal's Remains, p. 305.
‡ Strype's Grindal, p. 313.

The chancellor, having received the foregoing accusations, immediately addressed a letter to the vice-chancellor, Dr. May, and the heads of colleges, in which he promised to afford them all the assistance in his power, giving them directions how to bring their differences to a favourable termination. They signified in their answer that, after due consideration, they would use their utmost efforts to bring Mr. Cartwright to conformity, and reform those things which were amiss; but if their efforts failed, they would seek his further assistance to supply their want of ability. The chancellor's letter was read in the regent-house the day on which it was received, which created extreme uneasiness among the friends of truth and justice, who anxiously sought to procure Mr. Cartwright the doctor's degree. His professorship implied his qualification for this degree, and, by the urgent importunity of friends, he put in his claim for the diploma; but the symptoms of reform in him were too apparent to allow of his obtaining that honour! The measure was, therefore, strongly opposed by the vice-chancellor, and a stop was put to the proceeding, to the extreme regret of his numerous friends.* The title of doctor is however attached to his name, but on what ground we have not been able to learn.† On the adoption of these prompt measures, Mr. Cartwright, not forgetful of himself, appealed to the chancellor, and defended his conduct in an "elegant" Latin letter, addressing him as follows:—

"Right Honourable,—Since you are the common patron and defender of literary men of every nation, I entertain a pleasing hope that I also may share in your kind attention. Since many learned men have both experienced and openly proclaimed your remarkable benevolence, I pray let me also, who am not quite a stranger to literature, be a partaker. To my great unhappiness, I know the truth of the proverb, 'Nothing flies faster than calumny;' nothing is more quickly raised, or spread with greater facility. If the calumny which has been raised within the walls of the university had not been carried to the house and the ears of our most worthy chancellor, my grief had not been so great; but I confess it cuts me to the heart to be represented to your excellency as a vile person, yea, as an enemy. I may truly declare

* Strype, vol. i. p. 625. † Dyer's Hist. vol. i. p. 97.

that, if some persons were not now absent, there would be no necessity for me to attempt to vindicate myself to your excellency.

"As you allow me to speak freely, I solemnly assure you I have been most scrupulously averse from strife and contention. I have taught nothing which did not naturally arise from the passage on which I was lecturing; yea, when occasions of speaking on the habits have come in my way, I have even avoided them. But I do not deny that I have said our ministry has deviated from that of the primitive and apostolic church; to the purity of which I wished ours to be conformed: but this I said in so candid and modest a way that none but ignorant or malicious persons could find fault. Yet I hear that I am accused to your excellency.

"If you ask, how I can prove this? See, most noble Sir, I bring the testimony of many most unexceptionable witnesses who were present. Little can, indeed, be wanting to prove my innocence; as I can bring almost the *whole university* to witness for me. For if the vice-chancellor had not refused to call a congregation when I requested him to do it, there is no doubt that I should have been perfectly freed from the calumny which has been raised against me.

"I cannot in a letter repeat verbatim all that was said in the lecture concerning which such rumours have been raised. But I most religiously promise, I will not conceal any thing if you wish to be acquainted with it; and, as I do not refuse correction, if I have committed any error, so I justly implore your protection in this affair. Do not, therefore, O most honourable Sir, suffer the enmity of certain men to oppress me, or rather to injure the truth itself: men who seek to indulge their private enmity against me, under pretence of promoting the interests of peace and of the church. May the Lord Jesus Christ, by His Holy Spirit, daily increase your excellency's wisdom and piety."*

In conformity to what is imbodied in this address, a considerable part of the university was in favour of Mr. Cartwright; and among his numerous friends were many distinguished ornaments of literature, by whom he was admired and esteemed, and who, at this painful crisis, firmly supported him. They came forward, at this juncture, like men of integrity and worth; and, in their testimonial

* Strype's Annals, vol. ii. Appen. p. 1.

addressed to the chancellor, they manfully defended him, and exposed, as follows, the open slander and unjust accusations of his adversaries:—

"It has been reported to your excellency that Mr. Cartwright is greatly disliked here; that, in his office as professor of theology, he first threw about sparks of discord, which afterward increased into a flame; and that he prides himself beyond all bounds in controversies concerning the ministry and the habits. But we, whose names are hereunto subscribed, who were present at those lectures from which this rumour arose, do testify that we never heard any thing from which strife or discord has arisen. He did not, indeed, touch the controversy concerning the habits; but he mentioned something about the ministry, to which rule he wished that ours might be conformed: but he did this with that *caution* and *modesty* which ought to have secured him from the calumny which is spread abroad."*

This document was subscribed by *fifteen* persons, all celebrated members of the university. Mr. Cartwright was, however, silenced from his lecture. But, at this crisis, another testimonial was presented to the chancellor, containing these remarkable statements:—

"Most honourable Sir,—We have been very much concerned by the rumour which lately reached us of your displeasure against our Cartwright, and the alienation of your mind from him. We are all greatly obliged to you both as the patron of each individual, and as the common parent of the university. Though we particularly love Cartwright, that *wonderful ornament of literature*, nothing can be more unpleasant to us than that we should be the means of adding to your cares and anxieties, or that he should be brought into suspicion and disesteem among good men. As we owe great respect to you, we have thought it both our duty and his to mitigate the sorrow occasioned by *misrepresentation*, and if possible to reinstate Cartwright in your favour and in his former situation. Though we may seem to act rather inconsiderately, yet we must venture to intrude our letters upon you, notwithstanding you are so much occupied, and almost worn out with affairs of state. We cannot think it right that, while others have been so

* Strype, vol. ii. p. 2.

hasty to accuse, we should be slow to defend; and we assure ourselves that you will listen as freely to this defence as to a *false accusation*.

"It is not necessary for us to say much of Cartwright's general behaviour, as we are persuaded that no man can accuse him of any wickedness, or convict him of any scandal in his whole life. But that it may appear to your honour what kind of a man they have *maliciously* summoned before them, we will with truth affirm that he is a *pattern of piety* and *uprightness*. What better model can we find than his example and instructions? May we love and practise them more and more!

"We know that his religion is sincere and free from blemish: for he has not only emerged from the vast ocean of papistical heresies, and cleansed himself with the purest waters of the Christian religion, but, as at a rock, he strikes at those futile and trifling opinions which are daily disseminated. He adheres to the Holy Scriptures, the most certain rule of faith and practice. We know that he has not passed these limits. He has not fallen into any error, nor been seduced by any novelty. In him, therefore, we have a bulwark, not only against the old fables of the papists, from which we do not apprehend much danger, but also against the new opinions of crafty men, which threaten a more grievous plague. Of these particulars you may rest well assured.

"We admire and revere his learning. What is elsewhere said by the poet may be said of him: 'I admit he is skilful in all that becomes a free man to understand.' He is well skilled both in the Latin and Greek languages, an accomplishment which the poet highly applauds. To the knowledge of these he has also added that of the Hebrew tongue, which requires not a little labour; and, though we may find his equals in each separately, he has certainly *no superior* in them all! How profitable these are in the study of theology may appear from this circumstance, that immense multitudes flock to hear him daily. They pay the greatest attention, and readily adopt his opinions; and this not as perhaps it has been insinuated to you—that he is always bringing forward some novelty to tickle the ears of his auditors with strange notions; but such is the accuracy of his interpretations,

his felicity in teaching, and the gravity of his subjects, that the weight of his sentiments seems to surpass the fluency of his language.

"This is our opinion of him, which we are induced to send to you, not by any entreaties or private friendships, but because we wish well to the virtue and piety of the man. Now we most humbly beseech your honour that, if you have conceived any bad opinion of him, you would dismiss it from your mind, and give credit to us who are well acquainted with his character, religion, and learning, rather than to anonymous slanders destitute of truth and candour.

"Most excellent chancellor, preserve to your university the man whom she always so anxiously desired, and whose voice she heard with the greatest delight while she possessed him. This *most distinguished scholar* of a celebrated university is a client worthy of so great a patron. In his whole life he has been the ornament and honour of this university, but of late much more so than formerly: for he is esteemed, not only by our domestics and families, but much more by foreigners, whose state of exile is rendered less painful by the sweetness of his disposition and learning, and who do not hesitate to compare him to those whose fame is so illustriously spread among foreign nations.

"Though we who beg this from you are but few, yet we ask it in the name of many: for there is scarcely any man who does not admire and love him, and who does not think that he ought by all means to be defended. If, therefore, you wish well to the university, you cannot do any thing more useful, gratifying, or acceptable, than to preserve Cartwright to her. May God long preserve you safe to us, and to the nation! Cambridge, July the third. Your honour's most obliged servants." *

This extraordinary testimonial requires no comment. The important document, from eye-witnesses, contains sufficient commendation of Mr. Cartwright's piety, erudition, moderation, and usefulness. It was subscribed by *eighteen* celebrated members of the university, some of whom were afterward made bishops; but, surely, the man of whom such things could with truth be said ought to have been protected—not severely punished. On these

* Strype, vol. ii. Appen. p. 2, 3.

powerful applications, the chancellor interposed, and gave orders for Mr. Cartwright to be restored to his usual exercise, which created no ordinary joy and thanksgiving in the university. His enemies, nevertheless, refused to sanction what their chancellor recommended, and he was still prevented from resuming his lecture. The members of the university, undismayed, continued to espouse his cause; and, having ascertained the chancellor's favour towards their learned professor, they immediately sent him the following petition, earnestly soliciting that Mr. Cartwright might be permanently settled in his lecture:—

"You can scarcely believe, most honourable Sir; indeed you cannot think how much you lately gratified the scholars of Cambridge, and how highly we esteemed the favour, seeing we had so long been in anxious suspense concerning Cartwright. While we revolved many dangers in our minds, a certain report reached us that every thing between you and him had fallen out agreeably to our wishes; that you had most humanely freed him from all the charges which had been unjustly brought against him; and that you had also sent letters to our governors to soften the minds of those who had exasperated you against him. It gave us the greatest satisfaction that you had promised to beautify the church, and to restore her splendour. Therefore, what you have so justly done for Cartwright, not only is a witness and evidence of your virtue and piety, but also we, numerous as we are, and many others, who, by his attention and learning, are instructed in religion, shall hereafter come forth into the Christian world with increased advantages.

"But alas! as there is no unalloyed happiness here, so no little grief is mixed with the pleasure which we derived from your kindness to Cartwright: for though you have restored him to us, yet he lives in silence, and he is not admitted to his usual office of teaching. Hence we again address ourselves to you, our most worthy chancellor and excellent patron; and we humbly pray that the college may be open to him, and that he may not be restrained from the course in which he proceeded, with great credit to himself and with no less advantage to us. It is to us, indeed, a great happiness that you have a good opinion of him. If to this you add that we may again enjoy his learning, of which to our great

grief we have been long deprived, we will trouble you no more on this business, unless we are more vehemently urged to it.

"We formerly interceded with you for Cartwright only, but now we are engaged for the common good. For it is not only his interest, but ours also, that this liberty should be granted him. We know, indeed, that you are well inclined to this; yet because those refuse to do it who, under your honour, are intrusted with the government of our public concerns, yield to the prayer of Cartwright and of us, so that they may be encouraged to do it by greater authority from you. Let it be so done that it may be seen you have to the utmost consulted our studies, and the expectation of that most upright man. It is as needful to him to be restored to his functions of public teaching as to touch the goal. There is no reason for you to be afraid of any disputes or controversies. You have the word of a most holy man; for, indeed, no scar of any wound shall be renewed. Go on then as you have begun to think well of him, and vindicate him from the unjust calumnies of malevolent men: for, be assured, there is no man either for religion or learning more worthy of the patronage and protection of so great a man. May God very long preserve your honour, and favour your determinations!"*

This petition, subscribed by *twenty-two* members of the university, shows how high was the reputation of the learned theologian. The chancellor considered the case "with much deliberation and meekness;" after which, to stay the progress of these painful and oppressive proceedings, he gave instructions to the heads of the university; and, having stated the high testimonials he had received of Mr. Cartwright, he added, "What mind he had in moving these matters I perceive by his communication *not to be much reprehended*, being, as it seemeth, not of any *arrogancy* or *intention to move troubles*, but, as the reader of the Scripture, to give notes by way of comparison between the order of the ministry in the times of the apostles and the present times in this church of England. But, weighing with myself what occasions others hearkening to this novelty may take to breed offence in the church, not only among the adversaries, but also the professors of true religion, I have thought good to use my authority as chancellor, to charge Mr. Cartwright

* Strype, vol. ii. Appen. p. 3, 4.

not to deal any further in these kind of questions in his readings, or sermons, or otherwise, until some order may be taken therein this Michaelmas term, upon more commodity of conference meet for such a matter; whereto *he hath accorded*. In the mean season I think it also good that no *contrary* dispute or argument be used herein in the university to provoke further altercation; the manner whereof I commit to your consideration."*

This address discovers great prudence and moderation, showing that the chancellor wished to treat the Margaret Professor with candour and lenity. He commanded that the dispute should be dropped on both sides; to which, as he reminded the heads of houses, Mr. Cartwright had agreed. The chancellor only prohibited his reading on "those nice questions;" but the vice-chancellor and heads "stayed him from reading at all!" These forward gentlemen, therefore, outrun their chancellor; and, instead of forbearing disputes, as he had commanded them, they added fuel to the fire, and soon after expelled the learned theologian from the university!

The worthy chancellor also addressed a letter to Mr. Cartwright; and, having given him suitable advice, he reminded him that his opponents had accused him of factious innovation, and of bringing into suspicion of novelty that cause which originated with Christ and his apostles. To these disingenuous imputations Mr. Cartwright replied, by reminding the chancellor that he had stirred no new doctrines; yet that he would not be frightened from the truth by the charge of novelty. He moreover hoped that the chancellor would not charge the moving of things which ought not to be moved against those who did not innovate in any thing whatsoever. He added, that the chancellor knew whose words those were, "that old laws were very weak and rude." He needed not, however, to plead in defence of novelty, since the cause which he defended, being upwards of one thousand, five hundred years old, was venerable enough for its antiquity.

The heads of colleges had already suspended Mr. Cartwright from his official exercises; he therefore complained to the chancellor of their unkind usage, and charged them with injustice, for putting him to silence in opposition to his honourable instructions,

* Strype, vol. i. p. 626, 627.

who had so far favoured him as to allow him to continue his public lectures. He accordingly solicited the chancellor to hear the cause and judge for himself, declaring his readiness to submit to his honourable decision. But, lest this great statesman should say that he was unable to judge, or that he had not sufficient leisure for this purpose, Mr. Cartwright observed that, if the cause were just; if it were necessary for the proper government of the church; if without such judgment the commonwealth would suffer, and the parts sustain injury,—the cause was worthy of his honourable attention, and therein he might employ to great advantage the light of his own understanding and the divine endowments of his mind. The cause, by way of recompence, would improve him; and render him, however eminent before, still more honourable; and, however oppressed with the weight of business, would revive and refresh him; and, though ready to sink, would uphold him with strong and weighty support.

These, our historian adds, "were the *over-weaning conceits* which Mr. Cartwright had of his discipline!" * All who are acquainted with the professor's character and principles will be disposed to question whether he was over-much conceited. He undoubtedly considered his opinions far more agreeable to the New Testament than the observances of the Established Church, which at that period made no pretensions to a divine institution, but, being professedly derived from the Romish hierarchy, were founded on the authority of man, and by that authority incorporated with the civil constitution. It betrays a mean and unworthy spirit, when historians so profusely reproach the memory of great and good men for not measuring their religion by the legislative standard—for believing what appeared to them to be the truth of God—for making the Holy Scriptures the only test of faith and worship—and for recommending these important doctrines to the approbation of posterity.

Notwithstanding the various applications to the chancellor, and his favourable inclination towards Mr. Cartwright, his intention was frustrated, and without effect. The dominant ecclesiastics were resolved to make him an example; and having already silenced him, and being aware of his reputation in the university, as well as

* Strype, vol. ii. p. 3, 4.

of the chancellor's inclination to treat him with lenity, therefore, lest he should be re-admitted to his office, and thwart their oppressive measures, they implored the chancellor not to allow him the least encouragement, insinuating that his opinions were inconvenient and dangerous! Dr. Whitgift, one of the heads, took an active part in these proceedings, and betrayed great indiscretion and violence, opposing and persecuting that cause which he had heretofore zealously promoted.*

Archbishop Parker enlisted in this cause, and applied to the chancellor. The venerable primate, having assumed the lofty spirit of his order, stigmatized Mr. Cartwright and his brethren *precisions;* and said, "that he feared they nourished some *monster,* and dealt in *pretended fair appearances!*" He raised the common hue and cry that the church was in danger, and that the queen would be under the necessity of restraining these men by the sword of justice! He accused them of loving the applause of men more than the glory of God, and of refusing obedience to magistrates in things indifferent, declaring "that her Majesty's sword would be compelled to cut off this stubborn multitude, which daily increased!"†

The candid reader will easily perceive the design of these imputations from the primate, who, on the motion of Cecil, addressed a letter also to Mr. Cartwright, with a view "to moderate him, and persuade him by his grave and fatherly admonitions to forbear stirring any more in these matters," which, in his opinion, was likely to break the peace of the church. The archbishop, however, complained to Cecil of his want of success; and of Mr. Cartwright, he said, "You can tell how well he followed your counsel and mine; but surely, Sir, it is a matter of great importance, and so I leave the contemplation of it to your wisdom."

The venerable prelate, not satisfied with these efforts to promote the welfare of the church, wrote also to her Majesty, censuring the puritans for holding that archbishops with their offices and benefices ought to be abolished! This touched the primate in a very tender part. But, to finish the censure, his grace added, that when they had accomplished the abolition of archbishops, her Majesty's council would have too much to do, in addition to their

* Strype, vol. i. p. 627. † Strype's Parker, p. 313.

other weighty affairs, in staying the unruliness of certain ministers of religion, and the laity for their insolent living!*

From this detail of facts, it was too obvious that Mr. Cartwright's adversaries not only represented his principles and intentions in the most unfavourable light, but were also resolved to proceed against him with the utmost severity. To prepare the way, Dr. Whitgift and his colleagues made another vigorous effort, and "obtained a new body of statutes for the university." Whitgift, more officious than the rest, waited upon the chancellor, and made him acquainted with the statutes requiring amendment, and with other things necessary for the more effective government of that seat of learning. On his return, therefore, to Cambridge, he and his colleagues drew up a new code, hoping it "would be found very profitable to the state and good government of the university." The new statutes were presented to the chancellor, by whom they were allowed and confirmed; for which Whitgift and his brethren "acknowledged his singular goodness." These measures were adopted professedly to establish conformity with greater rigour; but, as might have been expected, they created great murmuring and discord in the university, by the unnatural restraint of the liberties and immunities of the colleges.†

The first operation of the new statutes were directed with vengeance against the Margaret Professor and those who espoused the cause of reform; and the contrivers found these formidable weapons exactly suited to their wishes. Mr. Cartwright had so great credit in the regent-house that the dominant party were under fearful apprehension of his being chosen to the office of vice-chancellor; to prevent which, as well as to retain the power in their own party, they procured the alteration of the statute, whereby the choice, which had hitherto been in the body of the regent-house, was confined to one of the two whom the heads of colleges should nominate!‡ This crafty precaution enabled them not only to retain the power, but also to carry every measure in their own way.

These pernicious and oppressive proceedings awakened deep concern in the minds of many distinguished persons, who beheld

* Strype's Parker, p. 312, 313. † Strype's Parker, p. 311, 312; Whitgift, p. 18.
‡ Clark's Lives, p. 22.

their appalling influence on Christian freedom and the immunities of the university. Mr. Edward Deering, under a conviction of their mischievous character, wrote a pressing letter to Chancellor Burghley, showing that, by listening to the heads of houses for the adoption of new statutes, inevitable distress was inflicted on those who feared God, and an intolerable burden on the consciences of those who dare not yield to sin, addressing the chancellor as follows:—

"Dr. Whitgift is but a man, and God hath suffered him to fall into great infirmities. He is so froward against Mr. Cartwright and others that he betrayeth a conscience full of sickness. His affections ruled him, and not his learning, when he framed his cogitations to get more statutes. It grieveth even my very soul to remember the faults of these heads of colleges; and you, if you be happy, will seek speedily to remedy them. They keep benefices, and are non-residents. While they are clothed in scarlet, their flocks perish with cold; and while they fare deliciously, their people famish with most miserable hunger. This fault is intolerable, and such as God abhorreth. In addition to the requests that have heretofore been made to you for these statutes, I have to make another. You who have been so easily brought to hurt God's people, to do pleasure to the pope, and, with so fearful statutes, have proceeded to the punishment of such small offences, now make some *good* statutes that may punish sin. And I beseech you, even in the blood of Jesus Christ which hath sanctified his people, send down a new statute, that no master of a house shall have a benefice except he serve it himself. Contemn not this petition, nor cast it lightly away. You live by the Lord; therefore present your conscience before him."*

The public murmurs were unavailing. The new regulations were presently brought into active operation, and employed as engines of oppression against some of the worthiest members of the university. Though the authority of the heads of houses had no need of enlargement, yet, by this piece of intrigue, they were invested with that additional power, by which they were enabled to proceed with "good success" against several learned collegians.† These uncatholic measures having been effectively directed against

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xii. art. 36.

† Strype, vol. i. p. 628.

the friends of the learned professor, he had no reason to expect milder treatment; and he soon felt the effects of their power. To pave the way for a triumphant combat, it was deemed necessary to secure the approbation of the chancellor by exposing and degrading Mr. Cartwright's principles; therefore Dr. Whitgift sent the chancellor a letter, dated August 19, 1570, insinuating "how dangerous and destructive they were, both to religion and the constitution of the Established Church," addressing him as follows:—*

"I have received your letters, right honourable, and have signified to the others, which also wrote to your honour, your contentment with our doings touching Mr. Cartwright. I think your honour doth not fully understand Mr. Cartwright's opinions; therefore I have here set down so many of them as he hath uttered to me in private conference, which he hath also openly taught.—That there ought not to be in the church of Christ either archbishops, archdeacons, deans, chancellors, or any other, whereof mention is not expressly made in the Scriptures.—That the offices of the bishop and deacon, as they are now in the Church of England, are not allowable.—That there ought to be an equality of all ministers, and every one to be chief in his own cure.—That ministers ought to be chosen by the people, as they were in the apostles' time.—That no one ought to be a minister unless he have a cure.—That a man should not preach out of his own cure.—That the order of calling and making ministers now used in the Church of England is extraordinary, and to be altered."†

How these opinions, admitting they were correctly stated, were destructive both to religion and the church would undoubtedly puzzle all the learning of Oxford and Cambridge to discover; but by what means the historian made the discovery he has not furnished any information, and it is unnecessary to make inquiry. Dr. Whitgift rendered himself famous by his opposition to Mr. Cartwright; and he found it to be the road to high preferment. He engaged not only in disputing and writing against him, but also in the punishment of him, enjoying the assistance of his colleagues. Having considered his opinions as dangerous, he wrote a professed refutation of them, which he intended for pub-

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 19. † Ibid. Appen. p. 9, 10.

lication. To render his production the more effective, he presented the manuscript to the inspection and approbation of Archbishop Parker; stating that he had urged Mr. Cartwright to furnish reasons for his assertions, but had hitherto been unsuccessful; that such of his opinions as he had heard he had answered, and had declared his judgment of the rest. He acknowledged his boldness in troubling his grace to read his papers; especially with a view that if any thing was amiss it might be altered; if any thing superfluous, it might be suppressed; if any thing omitted, it might be added. Cartwright's doctrine, he observed, was plausible, especially to those who were delighted with the spoils of the church: it was convenient, therefore, that something should be done to resist and uproot his opinions. He concluded by beseeching the primate to take in good part what he had done, and favour him with his advice and judgment on the subject. It does not indeed appear whether his grace approved or disapproved of the intended refutation, but it is certain the work was never published. The archbishop might probably conclude that it would be far better, and more conducive to the welfare of the church, not to allow the controversy to appear before the eye of the public.*

The university doctors went a shorter way to work. They employed other and heavier weapons than pen and paper, in which they had no doubt of easy triumph. The professor was convened before the vice-chancellor, Dr. May, Dr. Whitgift, and others, and underwent an examination on sundry doctrines supposed to have been delivered in his public lectures. Without at all appealing to the authority of the Scriptures, they affirmed that those doctrines were contrary to the religion established by public authority; therefore they imperiously demanded of him a recantation of his opinions. The Margaret Professor solicited a slight degree of forbearance, by being permitted to commit his sentiments to writing, when he stated his views in the following propositions:—

"That the names and functions of archbishops and archdeacons ought to be abolished.—That the offices of lawful ministers of the church, viz. bishops and deacons, ought to be reduced to their apostolical institution: bishops to preach the word of God and

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 19, 20.

pray, and deacons to be employed in taking care of the poor.—That the government of the church ought not to be intrusted to bishops' chancellors or the officials of archdeacons, but every church ought to be governed by its own ministers and presbyters.—That ministers ought not to be at large, but every one should have the charge of a particular congregation.—That no man ought to solicit or to stand a candidate for the ministry.—That ministers ought not to be created by the sole authority of the bishop, but to be openly and fairly chosen by the people. To effect this reformation," it is added, "that every one ought to labour in his calling: the magistrate by his authority, the minister by the word, and all by their prayers."*

These positions are styled "dangerous and untrue," tending to the "ruin of religion and learning," being "heterodoxes and misrepresentations;" on which the reader will make his own comments.† Mr. Cartwright had no sooner furnished these propositions than the heads of colleges proceeded to crush their victim. Dr. Whitgift, being chosen vice-chancellor, summoned him before their tribunal; when this imperious ecclesiastic, "armed with authority,"‡ demanded his absolute and final answer—whether he would recant the doctrines he had taught! Mr. Cartwright had too much courage and piety to become a vassal and a hypocrite, by bartering his principles and his conscience to allay the fiery intolerance of mortals. No consideration on earth could induce him to revoke and deny those doctrines which he believed to be the truth of God; so that his opponents found it equally difficult to bring him to a recantation of his opinions as to stop the sun in his course. Their unrighteous demands betrayed the weakness of their cause and their persecuting spirit; but Mr. Cartwright honestly and unhesitatingly avowed the doctrines he had taught, which he still believed, and could in no wise renounce. On this spirited declaration, Dr. Whitgift, having consulted his colleagues, pronounced upon Mr. Cartwright this definitive sentence:—

"That, seeing no admonition would help, but that he still persisted in the same mind, he did therefore pronounce him, the said

* Strype's Whitgift, Appen. p. 11.

† Strype, vol. i. p. 623; Collier's Hist. vol. ii. p. 525. ‡ Fuller's Cam. p. 141.

Mr. Cartwright, to be removed from his said lecture, and, by his final decree or sentence, did then and there remove him and declare the said lecture void; and that he minded, according to the foundation thereof, to proceed to the election of a new reader. And further, he did then and there, by virtue of his office, inhibit the said Mr. Cartwright from preaching within the said university, and the jurisdiction of the same."*

Mr. Cartwright was deprived of his professorship when there were not two persons in the university suitable to occupy the important office. The clergy in general were in a state of most deplorable ignorance, and were far more concerned to obtain wealth and ease than to discharge their official duties. Their learning and abilities were so mean that two could not be found sufficiently qualified to fill the professor's chair. This information the archbishop sent to the queen, immediately after Mr. Cartwright's deprivation, complaining that the collegians were so deficient in "solid learning and divinity." We leave the reader to inquire whether these rash proceedings were not an open insult to the university? Mr. Cartwright complained, and well he might, that this was not a very honourable method of refuting his opinions, but a substitution of authority for argument. The strong arm of power is assuredly the best reason persecution ever furnished in conquering its victims. His opponents collected from his public lectures certain other disputed points; and, since they are said to be "dangerous and seditious," and contain the most offensive doctrines he held, even in the opinion of his enemies, they are inserted for the information of the reader.

That, in reforming the church, it was necessary to reduce all things to the apostolical institution.—That no one ought to be admitted into the Christian ministry who was unable to preach.—That only those who ministered the word ought to pray publicly in the church, or administer the sacraments.—That popish ordinations were not valid.—That only canonical Scripture ought to be read publicly in the church.—That the public liturgy ought to be so framed that there might be no private praying or reading in the church, but that all the people should attend to the prayers of the minister.—That the service of burying the dead did not belong

* Clark, p. 17; Strype's Whitgift, Appen. p. 11.

any more to the ministerial office than to the rest of the church.—That equal reverence was due to all canonical Scripture and to all the names of God; there was, therefore, no reason why the people should stand at the reading of the gospel or bow at the name of Jesus.—That it was as lawful to sit at the Lord's table as to kneel or stand.—That the Lord's Supper ought not to be administered in private, nor baptism administered by women or laymen.—That the sign of the cross in baptism was superstitious.—That it was reasonable and proper that the parent should offer his own child to baptism, making confession of that faith in which he intended to educate it, without being obliged to answer in the child's name, "I will," "I will not," "I believe," &c., nor ought women or persons under age to be sponsors.—That, in giving names to children, it was convenient to avoid paganism, as well as the names and offices of Christ and angels.—That it was papistical to forbid marriages at any particular time of the year, and to grant licenses at those times was intolerable.—That private marriages, or such as were not published in the congregation, were highly inconvenient.—That the observation of Lent, and fasting on Fridays and Saturdays, was superstitious.—That the observation of festivals, and trading or keeping markets on the Lord's-day, were unlawful.—That, in the ordination of ministers, pronouncing the words, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost," was both ridiculous and wicked.—That kings and bishops ought not to be anointed.*

Mr. Cartwright had occasionally adverted to these topics in his lectures; and, as these particulars were collected by his adversaries, and sent to the court by Whitgift to "incense" the queen against him, we may conclude that they contain the most grievous offences that could be alleged, his enemies being judges. It will, however, be the wonder of posterity, that any professed protestant could be so blind or so perverse as to conclude that these propositions were both "dangerous and seditious!" But that learned divines should be molested and persecuted for believing and preaching these doctrines was an outrage on Christianity and common sense. These and similar opinions constituted the basis on which the foreign reformed churches founded their separation from the papal church. They were also, in general, the doctrines of the principal English

* Strype, vol. i. p. 629.

Reformers; and multiplied instances might be adduced in confirmation of this statement. The leading Reformers in the days of King Edward anxiously sought to obtain a purer reformation than that which was accomplished; and the author, who has recorded indisputable evidence of the fact,* also adds, That he was not afraid of exceeding the truth when he said, "that if the English Reformers had been left to their own choice, if they had not been held back and retarded by a large mass of popishly-affected clergy in the reign of King Edward, and restrained by the supreme civil authority on the accession of Elizabeth, they would have brought the government and worship of the Church of England nearly to the pattern of other reformed churches."†

If the reader advert to the opinions of the leading Reformers under Queen Elizabeth, as already stated, he will clearly ascertain that Mr. Cartwright was guilty of doing only what other Reformers had done as an acknowledged duty they owed to God; but, if he had exceeded all his learned brethren in promoting reform, he was only worthy of higher commendation than they. The leading Reformers, whose honourable sentiments have been furnished, were highly applauded for advocating a more pure reformation than that which was obtained; why then was Mr. Cartwright condemned for noticing similar points of religious improvement? or why were they so highly applauded for their noble efforts, and he so severely censured and punished for the same thing? As the early protestants endeavoured to found the Reformation on the sole basis of the holy Scriptures, so Mr. Cartwright advocated the same hallowed principle; and, with them, he made an appeal to inspired truth in defence of greater purity and freedom in the church of God. It will be admitted that his opponents sought to promote the welfare of the Established Church; but it will be questioned whether they advanced the kingdom of Jesus Christ. To silence pious and learned divines certainly was not the way to build up, but to pull down the church of God!

Mr. Cartwright had occasionally touched on the foregoing points in his public exercises, but most obviously, as already attested, without the remotest intention of promoting discord; and it should not be forgotten that all the discord that arose was promoted by

* M'Crie's Knox, vol. i. p. 385—396. † Ibid. p. 107.

his opponents, and not by him or his doctrine. Nevertheless, they who sought his ruin, having triumphed over him by deprivation from his office, soon after procured his expulsion from the university, on grounds as flimsy as the sentence was unjust. This was a short and easy method of refuting his opinions! The pretended occasion of his expulsion was considered as an offence of no ordinary magnitude. He was the senior fellow of the college, and only in deacon's orders, and the statute required such to enter the priesthood; but Dr. Whitgift no sooner became acquainted with these circumstances, than he concluded that Mr. Cartwright was *perjured*, and, without further admonition, or even the consent of the fellows, he exerted his interest with the heads of houses, and expelled him from the university! Thus Whitgift got rid of the man whose popularity was too great for his priestly ambition, stigmatizing him an enemy to peace and obedience, and declaring he could not establish order in the university while a man of his principles remained among them. This powerful ecclesiastic laboured to secure uniformity in religion, and to uphold existing abuses; but the fact of our theologian's expulsion will hardly be received as satisfactory evidence of his deserving such treatment.

The reader will clearly perceive that Mr. Cartwright lived in troublous times. He considered the pretended occasion of his expulsion as a mere cavil. The painful conflict, as derived from authentic records, exhibits the real principles of both parties. Whitgift came off the field as a mighty conqueror; while Mr. Cartwright, though in every respect his superior, was treated as an outcast and a vagabond. If he carried his views of ecclesiastical reform farther than did the heads of colleges, he was deserving only of greater commendation and encouragement, not of oppression and persecution. The reader will perhaps be surprised to learn that this arduous struggle is styled a "brisk, but *necessary* opposition" on the part of Whitgift against Cartwright!* Burghley, the chancellor, however, formed a very different opinion; and, in answer to a petition for Mr. Cartwright's restoration, he replied, "that his return to the university would be *very grateful* to him," and agreeable to his wishes; but as he had no power he could promise nothing.† It is not so easy to ascertain which was

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 21. † Strype's Annals, vol. ii. p. 190.

most prominent in Whitgift—ignorance, or perverseness, or something worse; he is, nevertheless, said not only to have spared no pains in promoting the peace and improvement of the university, but also that he quelled all disturbances "by the gravity of his example and the *judiciousness* of his proceedings!"* Another writer, without evidence, affirms not only that Mr. Cartwright was alienated from the established authorities, but also that he cherished a dislike of loyalty, yet he declares that "the university insulted him."† We make no comment on these representations; they speak sufficiently for themselves. Placed in these painful circumstances, it could hardly be expected that Mr. Cartwright would remain silent; but it might be supposed that he would attempt to defend his own character.

"It pleaseth the doctor," said he, "to compare those whom he put out of their livings without just cause to heretics and thieves; but all men understand how justly. Although it be unreasonable not to allow men to complain of their troubles, when he glories in troubling them; yet, which is the most intolerable, that besides the injury which he does them, he is angry that they will not lay hands on themselves by casting themselves out of their livings, or ever they be cast out by him. Tully makes mention of one Fimbria, who when he had caused Scelova, a singular man, to be wounded, and saw that he died not of it, convened him before the judges; and, being asked what he had to accuse him of, answered, 'That he did not suffer the whole weapon with which he was struck to enter into his body.' Even so the doctor is not content to do injuries to men; but he accuses them that they will not do it to themselves, or that they are not willing to suffer his weapons to enter so far as he would have them. What conscience is there that binds a man to depart from his living, though he liketh not all the orders that are used? Is it not enough to abstain from them if there be any evil in them? or to declare the unlawfulness of them when the reformation of them is not in his power?

"You exhort us to submit ourselves to good order, which we always have done, and are still ready to do,—to give up being contentious, which we never yet begun,—to join with you in preaching the word of God, when you have stopped our mouths,

* Christian Guardian for 1828, p. 6. † D'Israeli's Charles I. vol. iii. p. 238.

and will not suffer us to preach. So we exhort you in the name of God, and as you will one day answer before a just Judge, that you will not wilfully shut your eyes against the truth, and despise it, when the Lord sets it before you. You may be well assured that your driving out will draw the truth, and your imprisonment will set the truth more at liberty, and thereby prove itself to be neither Papistry, Anabaptistry, Donatism, nor any other heresy, which are by due correction repressed. As for the truth of God, the more it is laden, the more upright it standeth; and the more it is kept under, the more it forceth itself to rise; and it will undoubtedly get up, how large soever the stone which is laid upon it."*

Dr. Whitgift was jealous lest Mr. Cartwright should still enjoy the patronage of his friends at court, where many persons of the first distinction held him in very high repute;† but he exerted himself to put an end to this benefit, and to secure to himself the favour of courtiers. He could not endure Mr. Cartwright to enjoy the kindness of those who were disposed to serve him, either in the university or out of it; he therefore endeavoured to destroy his reputation in the higher ranks of society, as well as in the university. With too evident a design to accomplish this unworthy purpose, he addressed the following letter to Archbishop Parker:—

"My duty most humbly to your grace remembered. I am constrained sooner to trouble you than I had purposed. I have pronounced Mr. Cartwright to be no fellow here; because, contrary to the express words of his oath, and plain statute of this college, he hath continued here above his time, not being a full minister. Which truly I did not know, until now of late; for if I had known it before, I might have eased myself of much trouble, and the college of great contention. Hitherto, I thank God, it hath been as quiet a college as any at Cambridge. Now there are marvellous troubles and contentions, which I can ascribe to no cause so much as to Mr. Cartwright's presence here. I doubt he will make *some friends at court* to maintain him; and I have some understanding that he goeth about the same. I beseech your grace, let me have your assistance, either by your letters to my Lord Burghley, or my Lord of Leicester, or both; or by any other means you think best. Their whole purpose is to make me weary, because they take me to

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 195, 214, 218. † Strype's Whitgift, p. 76.

be an enemy to their factiousness and lewd liberty. If they may triumph over me once, peradventure the state here will be intolerable; but I doubt not of your grace's full assistance. Mr. Cartwright is flatly perjured! And I am verily persuaded that it is God's just judgment that he should be so punished, for not being minister, having so greatly defaced the ministry!"*

It is unnecessary to detain the reader by an exposure of these imputations. Whitgift was aware that this was going the sure way to work. He knew the venerable primate would rejoice to assist him to the uttermost in opposing every attempt to promote reform, by suppressing every deviation from the established order, and attempting to force uniformity on all parties. Nor can it be supposed that Mr. Cartwright would, at this crisis, be altogether unmindful of himself. He therefore addressed a letter to Chancellor Burghley, dated October 17, 1571, complaining of the unkind treatment he had received, and expressing a hope that his lordship would examine the untrue accusations brought against him.

"When I was first expelled from the college, I did not fly to you for protection, because I thought you were almost overwhelmed with the affairs of the state, to the number and weight of which I feared these disturbances would add a very grievous burden; I was therefore afraid that I should seem too importunate if I interrupted you while you were so incessently engaged for the public welfare, and it might look like a partial statement if I compressed into a single letter what appears to me a most equitable ground of complaint. I am apprehensive there are some persons who have unjustly accused me, and filled your ears with the bitterest complaints against me. Had they refrained from false accusations, I would have forborne this my statement of the simple truth. As things are, what was before improper has now become necessary; and I trust you will grant me a candid hearing. Surely, while they are so eager to accuse me, I ought not to be very backward to defend myself; nor can I think your lordship will refuse it from me. Indeed, a just defence ought to meet with a readier ear than a false accusation. I say I was unjustly expelled from the university. If you will investigate the matter, and inquire of those who are worthy

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 47.

of credit, you will very easily prove this, if it be not too troublesome and your numerous avocations will admit of it. A scholar of the university very humbly begs of the High Chancellor that the affair may be re-heard. I would write a full account of the matter, but I am afraid of perplexity; and therefore I will not put the whole in this letter, lest it should be unreasonably long. I would rather state the affair in your presence, which would enable me to be both more brief and distinct. Behold a new and cruel device of the most unjust of men, who omit nothing to consummate my wretchedness, since both water and fire are forbidden me. They seem to want nothing but a sack, that they may destroy me like a matricide. I hear also that I am accused of seditious and schismatical practises. O baseness! He who is trying to ruin others—he who inflicts the most grievous wound on others, cries out immediately if he be touched."*

Mr. Cartwright, in further exposure of these unrighteous proceedings, adverted to the pretended cause of his expulsion, which he could have patiently borne: but he complained of the false accusations preferred against him by his adversaries, and of their attempting to "consummate his wretchedness;" he therefore prayed his lordship to suspend his judgment till he had heard his defence. He concluded by reminding the chancellor that his expulsion was wholly arbitrary, being effected without the consent of the fellows!†

Mr. Cartwright in one of his publications acquits himself of the charge of *perjury*, and justifies his conduct by observing that his not seeking the order of priesthood was merely a cavil, and that the meaning of the statute was fully satisfied, which was intended to provide that collegians should not turn their studies to the professions of law and physic, but to furnish the college with a certain number of preachers, of which he was one as soon as he entered. Neither was there any duty of the ministry which the college could require of him that he was not enabled to perform by virtue of that ministry which he had received, and according to the laws of the Church of England: so that the law, whose meaning was fulfilled, did not require more. Also the corruption of the law, or at least, according to interpretation, binding men to beg a

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xii. art. 85. † Strype's Whitgift, p. 20.

ministry, and thereby testify of themselves that they were fit for it, might justly keep him back, knowing that he ought not to beg that sacred office.*

A modern author, a decided enemy to puritan principles, unhesitatingly declares, that Dr. Whitgift "invidiously stigmatized" Mr. Cartwright as flatly perjured; and that he scarcely merited such a charge, but other severities were unexceptionable. Cambridge, he adds, could not continue facilities for *undermining* the national institutions, nor could her honours be fairly claimed "by one who tasked a powerful and active mind to *force* a new religious polity upon the country."† Mr. Cartwright was never ambitious of university honours; and it is well known that he was an unalterable enemy to the use of *force* in matters of polity: forcible weapons, as he keenly felt, were exclusively in the hands of others. But Whitgift accused him of ambitiously aspiring after higher preferment in the university when he had justly merited expulsion from the place. "A man would not have thought," says he, "that one who hath ambitiously desired to be the queen's Majesty's divinity reader, and yet pretended such purity and simplicity, would on any occasion use such contemptuous and deriding speeches of one not so much his inferior."‡

Mr. Cartwright utterly denied this accusation as undeserving the least degree of credit, adding, that if he had ambitiously desired the office in question, he had been worthy of condemnation, but for which he had never opened his lips. "If I had," said he, "how knoweth the doctor, who maketh it lawful to ask it, that I did it *ambitiously?* So that unless he knew my *heart*, my labouring for it—if I had done so—is justified by his own divinity."§ Mr. Cartwright had taken his degrees in Arts and Bachelor of Divinity: but Whitgift disingenuously accused him of having sought the Doctor's degree;‖ to which he replied, "Herein I moved nothing, but yielded only to the request of certain friends. I had, before my grace was propounded to the schools, the advice of more than a dozen learned ministers, who, considering that I I had the *office* of a doctor or teacher in the university, were of

* Cartwright's Second Replie, Ded. † Soames' Elizabeth, p. 146.
‡ Whitgift's Defence, p. 586. § Cartwright's Second Replie, Ded.
‖ Whitgift's Defence, p. 781.

opinion that, for the good they esteemed might be done thereby, I might swallow the fond and idle ceremonies which accompany it."*

The severe treatment of Mr. Cartwright, as might have been anticipated, created a great degree of dissatisfaction in the university, where his numerous friends, persons of great eminence, exercised strong sympathy on this painful occasion. They considered it as extreme hardship that a man so distinguished for piety and learning should be so heavily censured, without being allowed a conference before impartial judges. But Whitgift and his colleagues, to make their cause appear plausible, and to silence the contrary party, subscribed the following testimonial:—

"Whereas it is reported that Mr. Cartwright offering disputations and conference touching the assertions uttered by him and subscribed with his hand, and that he could not obtain his request therein; this is to testify, that in presence of us, whose names are here under-written, and in our hearing, the said Mr. Cartwright was offered conference of divers, and namely of Dr. Whitgift, who offered that, if the said Mr. Cartwright would set down his assertions in writing, and his reasons unto them, he would answer the same in writing also, which Mr. Cartwright refused to do. Further, the said Dr. Whitgift, at such time as Mr. Cartwright was deprived of his lecture, did in our presence ask the said Mr. Cartwright whether he had, both publicly and privately, divers times offered the same conference unto him by writing, or not; to which Mr. Cartwright answered that he had been so offered, and that he refused the same. Moreover, the said Mr. Cartwright did never offer any disputation, but upon these conditions, viz. that he might know who should be his adversaries, and who should be his judges, meaning such judges as he himself could best like. Neither was this kind of disputation denied him; but only he was required to obtain license of the queen's Majesty, or the council, because his assertions were repugnant to the state of the commonwealth, which may not be called into question by public disputation, without license of the prince or her highness's council." †

Notwithstanding the plausible pretensions and appearances of

* Cartwright's Second Replie, Ded.; Strype's Whitgift, p. 64.

† Paule's Whitgift, p. 16—18.

this testimonial, when the whole of the case is impartially examined, it will be found to contain no just reflection on our divine. It is manifest that Dr. Whitgift and Mr. Cartwright had frequent conference on the points in dispute;* but there is not the least evidence that he ever declined a public conference before *impartial judges*. When his adversaries agreed to such a conference, they required him to obtain a license from the queen or council, because they knew he could not procure it; from which it is most obvious that he did not stand on equal ground with his opponents. The reader will therefore easily perceive that his proposals of a public disputation, even according to the statement of his enemies, were most equitable and just, but their's unreasonable, because impossible for him to observe. This agrees with the concurrent testimony of the disputants. Mr. Cartwright, afterward addressing the doctor, said, "I answered, that it was meet that the doctrine which I had taught openly should be defended openly: and beside that, I waited on two of the university doctors to be conferred with; I offered myself to your private conference, which, although you had promised, yet, under pretence that I was incorrigible, you would not perform. The truth is, you offered private conference by writing; but, having before experience of your unfaithfulness many ways, I refused." †

Whitgift insisted upon no more than Mr. Cartwright acknowledged, by stating that he avoided a public conference without leave of the higher powers. "I have sundry times," said he, "both publicly and privately, as I am able to prove by sufficient testimonies, and you cannot deny, offered you conference by writing of these matters: I have earnestly moved you to it, and you have always refused it. Howbeit," this high-toned doctor adds, "I refuse no way that shall be thought convenient to the *magistrate*." ‡ It has, indeed, been insinuated that Dr. Whitgift frequently offered to dispute with Mr. Cartwright, "even on his own terms," which the latter declined;§ for the truth of which no satisfactory evidence has ever been produced.

Mr. Cartwright, having no hope of obtaining employment congenial to his profession, was protected and comforted by those who

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 19, 21, 64. † Cartwright's Second Replie, Ded.
‡ Whitgift's Defence, p. 354; Strype's Whitgift, p. 64. § Biog. Brit. vol. vii. p. 4235.

could distinguish between the persecutor and the persecuted. A state of dependence could not be otherwise than painful to a virtuous and honourable mind; and in those evil days few could escape being harassed by spies and pursuivants. These considerations induced Mr. Cartwright to remind Whitgift that, "although you will grant us neither learning nor conscience, yet you might afford us so much wit as that we would not willingly and on purpose want those commodities of life which we might otherwise enjoy as well as you, if we had that gift of conformity which you have." * Whitgift tauntingly replied, "What commodities you want that I have I cannot conjecture. Your meat and drink is provided with less trouble and charges to you, and in a more delicate and dainty manner than mine is: your *ease* and *pleasure* ten times more; you do what you list; go when you list; come when you list; speak when you list, at your pleasure. What would you have more? I know not why you should complain, except you be of the same disposition with the Franciscan Friars, who, when they had filled their bellies at other men's tables, were wont to cry out and say, *How many things are we forced to endure?* Some men are delighted to be fed at other men's tables, and prefer popular fame before gold and silver!" †

Was the doctor then grieved that Mr. Cartwright, when turned out of his college and deprived of his daily bread, should find kindness elsewhere? or did he intend to set forth his own courtesy and kindness, when, purely for Mr. Cartwright's ease and comfort, he expelled him from the university? If Whitgift considered the loss of promotion so signal an advantage, why was he so greedy of preferment? After the doctor had taken away his bread, and silenced him from preaching, how unfeeling to reproach him with doing no good, and with depending on his friends for support!

Against the charge of having relinquished the ministry, Mr. Cartwright justly remarked, "If any have forsaken the ministry without just cause, they are guilty of an horrible fault; but I see you account them forsakers of the ministry whom you have thrust out. Such is your equity to *whip* them out, then for *going* out. And if they hold any of your tenths, and would be counselled by me, they should yield them into your hands, lest, in being par-

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 64; Cartwright's Replye, p. 57. † Whitgift's Defence, p. 283.

takers of your non-residence, they also drink of its plagues."* "After he had thrust me out of the college," Mr. Cartwright adds, "he accused me of going up and down, doing no good, and living at other men's tables. That I was not idle, I suppose he knoweth too well. Whether I was well occupied or not let it be judged. I lived, indeed, at other men's tables, having no house nor wife of my own; but not without their desire, and with small delight of mine, for fear of evil tongues. Although I were not able to requite it, yet towards some I went about it, instructing their children, partly in the principles of religion, and partly in other learning."†

Whitgift accused him of a wandering ministry, which he condemned, saying, "I muse with what face you can seek to deface true pastors, who do good in the church, though not so much as you think they should do; seeing you, and a number more, do *no good at all in any place*, but only range up and down, live at other men's tables, disturb the church, and think that you have done your duties, when you have defaced other men's doings! I am verily persuaded that he who preacheth at his own cure but one sermon in a *year* offendeth God less than you do who have forsaken your calling!"‡ Whitgift had the meanness to reproach Mr. Cartwright with that misery which he had himself created. He, moreover, upbraided him with living upon charity, when he knew who had deprived him of his honest livelihood,—of indolence, when he himself had suppressed his labours. Such was the reasoning of this fiery ecclesiastic! He put a gag in a man's mouth, then censured him because he did not talk! Mr. Cartwright forsook his calling as a man forsakes his money when he meets the robber—because he could not keep it. An author, adverse to his principles, states, that he was eminently distinguished in the university as a laborious student, an acute disputant, and an admired preacher.§

The great error at the Reformation originated in the assumption of authority to amalgamate the Christian church with the civil constitution, and to regulate all the affairs of religion by the exercise of power. Had those who made this assumption confined their attention to their own legitimate province, legislating only in *civil*

* Cartwright's Second Replie, p. 154. † Ibid. Ded.
‡ Whitgift's Defence, p. 241. § Lowndes' Manuel, vol. i. p. 356.

matters; had they left the churches to manage their own affairs, allowing unfettered Christianity to spread among the people; and had they gratefully accepted, and cordially obeyed, the legislation furnished by Jesus Christ and his apostles, they would have brought the Reformation to full maturity, and secured to themselves imperishable honour. But, so far from pursuing this course, observes the venerable Mr. Thomas Scott, "the connexion of religion with politics was one grand antichristian abuse which was universally adopted at the Reformation, by which modern Christianity is most strikingly discriminated from ancient."* The fact is too obvious that the heads of the Reformation slighted, if not discarded, the Saviour's regal supremacy, together with his holy administration; and this mistake, as might have been expected, was followed by secular patronage, penal sanctions, spurious religion, and priestly domination, trenching on the prerogative of Deity, and endangering man's eternal interest! This unwise assumption placed the people and their religion under subjection to the power of mortals! Men in official stations cherished a giddy fondness for pre-eminence, and claimed the power of oppressing their brethren, as if invested with a charter from heaven to be "lords over God's heritage." The authenticated fact cannot be blotted from the page of history, that this assumption has always corrupted the church or enslaved the state!

The prevailing evil arose principally from mistaken notions of the kingdom of Christ, which induced the unwarrantable assumption of power, obtruding on the Saviour's administration. Mr. Cartwright inculcated principles to counteract these dangerous errors. He wished all men to understand that Christ's kingdom was not secular but spiritual, and that those who secularized his kingdom desecrated Christianity and incurred fearful responsibility. The Lord Jesus exercised all-sufficient power to erect his spiritual kingdom, and to bring rebellious men to the obedience of faith, which the Saviour accomplished not by compulsory force, but by the persuasion of inspired truth: so our divine concluded that every system of expediency was absolutely exploded; that the revealed will of Jesus Christ was the only authorized rule in religious faith and practice; and that every man was bound by the

* Scott's Letters, p. 229.

highest authority to promote the unlicensed diffusion of the gospel. This, with him, was not a point of dubious speculation, but obvious and immutable truth. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

Though the suppression of religious principle was impossible, yet Queen Elizabeth resolved to disallow a difference of opinion on religious subjects; and her Majesty declared, "that it was not consistent with her safety, honour, and credit, to *permit* diversity of opinions in a kingdom where none but she and her council governed!"* To accomplish the royal wishes, her Majesty undertook to lecture her two archbishops: and, to enlighten their minds, she inculcated upon the venerable prelates, that diversity in religion was provoking to Almighty God, grevious to her Majesty, and ruinous to her people and country!—that her constant care was to govern the realm by good laws and ordinances, and as nearly as possible by one rule—that she had directed her people to obey humbly, and live godly, in unity and concord, without diversity of opinion, or novelty of observances; but, to her great grief, she understood that in sundry places, and by permission of her superior officers, a manifest disorder had crept into the church, and the inconvenience was likely to grow to the deformity of the nation and to the interruption of Christian charity. Her Majesty, therefore, peremptorily commanded her primate to confer with the other bishops, and, by coercion and censures, to maintain strict uniformity in religion.†

The puritans, in accordance with the most approved Reformers, considered that the Reformation was not carried far enough, but that the worship of God would be more pure when rendered more simple and freer from popish ceremonies.‡ But the queen was not to be trifled with in these matters. Her Majesty was exceedingly offended at her subjects, who could not measure their faith by the standard she had erected, nor regulate the worship of God by legislative enactments; but, to remedy this supposed evil, her Majesty addressed further instructions to Archbishop Parker, commanding him to suppress all existing diversities in religion throughout her dominions! The royal injunction instantly roused

* Strype's Annals, vol. i. p. 37. † Ibid. p. 460, 461.
‡ Nares' Burghley, vol. iii. p. 212.

the prelates to action.* In pliant obedience to this high authority, they directed vigorous efforts to fulfil the royal intentions.† The right reverend prelates resolved to reduce the church to one uniform order, and, for this purpose, cited the clergy to appear before them, when many were suspended and deprived, and others cast into prison. These dishonourable proceedings did not produce the perfect uniformity anticipated; but multitudes of churches were shut up for want of ministers, and the people were left to perish for lack of knowledge. This, the archbishop said, he foresaw before he commenced this service of the church; and that, when the queen appointed him to pursue this course, he reminded her Majesty that the precise Reformers would suffer the loss of their goods, and their bodies to be cast into prison, rather than renounce their principles!‡

The failure of these measures, but especially the increase of zealous Reformers, roused the indignation of Elizabeth, who not only renewed her injunction to the archbishop, but also issued a royal proclamation addressed "to all archbishops, bishops, justices, and all other head officers, commanding them to put in execution the act of uniformity, with all diligence and *severity*." This proclamation exhibited the spirit of royal intolerance, and required that all nonconformists should be immediately apprehended and cast into prison, and remain until they renounced their principles and proved their conformity,—all who forbore attending the common-prayer and receiving the sacrament should be immediately presented and punished; and all who used, in private or public, any other rites of common-prayer and administration of the sacraments, or maintained in their houses any persons guilty of these offences, should be punished with the utmost severity!§

This proclamation was followed by separate commissions to the bishops and their colleagues, commanding them to use every possible means to discover and to punish those who sought ecclesiastical reform. To awaken the commissioners to a discharge of their

* This ecclesiastical pliancy was remarkable; and Burnet observes that if Elizabeth had not outlived that generation, and had been succeeded by a popish prince, the bishops and clergy would probably have "turned about again to the old superstitions as nimbly as they had done in Queen Mary's days!"—*Burnet*, vol. ii. p. 401.

† Strype's Parker, p. 155. ‡ Ibid. p. 225; Strype's Grindal, p. 99.

§ Sparrow, p. 170.

duties, the queen's message was delivered to them in the Star Chamber, in which her Majesty reminded them that she could enjoy *no quiet of conscience* without an earnest prosecution of these measures; and that she could not consider any of her subjects as worthy of *protection* who sanctioned the doctrine or practice of these Reformers!* From these attested facts, and from many others which might be enumerated, the reader cannot be surprised that a modern writer styles Elizabeth, "the most despotic monarch, save and except her father, that ever swayed the sceptre of this realm."†

While the scrupulous puritans were treated thus, an author of high authority defended himself and his brethren. He declared that no minister or other person, whom envy and malice stigmatized puritan or precision, ever lifted up his hand against her Majesty or the state; but those who bore these odious names were the most faithful in serving her Majesty and their country, both in the garrison and in the field, to the hazard of their lives. These men, our author remarks, "are so ill thought of, as if they were traitors and rebels, who, nevertheless, have been so far from being seditious that they have at all times adventured their lives against seditious persons and rebels;" while their accusers "have been right-heartily-well content to take their ease and rest at home." He then adds, "Considering how many ways they were unjustly burdened, and brought into hatred without just cause, he supposed that no godly man would be offended if by lawful means he sought to clear himself and the rest of his brethren."‡

It will be perceived that those who assumed authority in religion struck at the very foundation of Christianity; and there was no remedy for this enormous abuse but an entire renunciation of this authority, allowing Christianity to rest on its original basis as fixed by Jesus Christ. The fact, as the reader has witnessed, is attested by the most faithful records that the Reformation, crippled and paralyzed by those in power, was prevented from being brought to maturity; and, from similar records, the fact is equally obvious that Mr. Cartwright's great aim was to carry onwards the great work of reformation by the use of most peaceable and hon-

* Sparrow, p. 170; Strype's Parker, p. 447, 457.

† Strictland's Queens, vol. vi. p. 284. ‡ Troubles at Frankfort, p. 168, 169.

ourable means, submitting all improvements to the authorities of the land. The reader will, therefore, inquire whether his conduct was deserving of severe censure, or high and honourable commendation?

It will be fully admitted that those who preferred the episcopal form of church government had an undoubted right to such preference, and no power on earth could legally deprive them of it; but it was impossible that this right could invest them with legitimate power to enforce their sentiments on others. Their right to choose for themselves was not a right to tyrannize over others; and it was so far from giving them authority to impose their opinions that it necessarily left all others in exactly the same circumstances, invested with an indubitable right to obey the laws of inspired truth, rejecting "for doctrines the commandments of men." But from the Saviour's declaration, "Where two or three are gathered together in his name, there he is in the midst of them,"—from his prayer in Gethsemine, "Not as I will, but as thou wilt,"—from the prayer which he pressed on his disciples, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven,"—from his absolute supremacy over his churches,—from his unqualified abhorrence of calling fire from heaven upon his enemies,—and from his refusing to sanction the prohibition of those who declined following him and conform to his views, the Lord Jesus furnished those salutary and decisive instructions, which, in such matters, cut off every species of coercive interference from man. Here the reader will easily appreciate the religious freedom furnished in the New Testament.

Mr. Cartwright was unable to comprehend how pure religion could advance and flourish when earthly power controlled its sacred ministry; and he was forced to conclude that spiritual religion refused to be governed by worldly elements. He had, moreover, too convincing evidence that Christianity, when regulated by human authority and worldly maxims, was made the instrument of tyranny, degradation, and misery; but that the Lord Jesus placed its spiritual character and holy administration far remote from earthly control. Its heavenly origin and holy purposes, in his opinion, ought to have protected it against the obtrusions of men, and been a sufficient guarantee against being

made the tool of domination. How could Christian men embrace a system of religion which appeared to them unsustained by Scripture, especially when it seemed to operate against their highest interest? Were the minds of the people so enveloped in darkness as to conclude that God had placed Christianity under the controlling power of men?

The foregoing grievous errors originated in mistaken views of the nature and immunities of Christian churches. The simplicity of these institutions, as furnished in the New Testament, constitutes their purity and strength; but additional laws and observances imposed by man, as all history shows, have, in every age, engendered deformity and corruption. As the only assistance Christianity needs is derived from itself, so its holy requirements exhibit not only the right, but also the obligation of every man to worship God; and men, said Bishop Hooper, are brought to recognise this "*only* by the word of Christ."* We may also observe that the right of private judgment is not only the corner-stone of religious freedom, but also the Creator's gift to man, for the use or abuse of which he holds every man amenable at his tribunal; and the magistrate bears the sword, not to punish religious exercise, but to protect every man in peaceable possession of this heavenly boon. If men in exalted stations may employ authority to force religion upon the people, may they not, by that authority, put down religion? and who will say they do wrong? Here may be recited two inquiries from the pen of George, Duke of Buckingham, who said, "I shall beg to propose whether there be any thing more directly opposite to the doctrine and practice of Jesus Christ, than to use any kind of force upon men in matters of religion? and, consequently, whether those who practise it, let them be of what church or sect they please, ought not justly to be called antichristian?"†

Mr. Cartwright was driven from the university and deprived of all ministerial usefulness, on which he retired to the continent; and then it was that he formed an acquaintance with Beza and other continental scholars. It is also stated that Mr. Cartwright was so highly esteemed abroad that he was chosen professor of divinity in the university of Geneva.‡

* Hooper's Declaration, p. 26. † Phœnix, vol. ii. p. 525. ‡ Martin's Epitome, p. 52.

During the foregoing struggle, the reform principles not only continued to retain an existence, but also obtained a fastness and ascendancy in the minds of all sound protestants. By overwhelming intolerance, the church was deprived of many of its brightest ornaments; and nearly all the faithful pastors were ejected, especially in the counties of Northampton, Warwick, Leicester, Suffolk, and Norfolk. While these alarming devastations were committed against the church of Christ, several thousands of ministers of inferior character, as common swearers, drunkards, and other unholy characters, only because they were ceremonially conformable, continued in their offices, enjoyed their livings, and obtained high preferment. Although most of the dignitaries had suffered persecution and banishment in the reign of Queen Mary, yet, being exalted to promotion and wealth, they forgot their former condition, and persecuted their brethren of the same faith whose understandings and consciences would not allow them to fall prostrate before the pretended uniformity.*

The oppressed servants of God, suffering under heavy pressures, felt deeply concerned for the safety of the protestant religion, as well as for the further reformation of the church. They laboured hard, and in the most peaceable manner, to promote the important object; but their efforts were unsuccessful. The right reverend prelates and other dignitaries, instead of listening to their reiterated cries, laid upon them heavier burdens. Numerous instances might be alleged in confirmation of this statement. Her Majesty also displayed high assumption, one instance of which may be mentioned. The queen not only commanded Archbishop Grindal to diminish the number of preachers, but also commanded all the bishops to suppress the religious exercises throughout England; that all who maintained or abetted them should be committed to prison; and that, for an example to others, they should receive "more sharp" punishment. Her Majesty further warned the bishops to be "careful and vigilant" in executing her command; but, if they failed to obey her instructions, she threatened to punish them "according to their deserts!"† Compulsory measures had been so long employed to promote the interests of popery; and, from the influence of prevailing ignorance and evil custom, similar

* Parte of Regis. p. 2—9. † Strype's Grindal, Appen. p. 86.

measures were employed to advance the cause of protestantism! This fatal error placed the Christian religion in awful jeopardy, under political control; and as the event proved, the scheme was admirably adapted to foster official pride and domination. The nation had been so long accustomed to this degrading and iniquitous system that its true character was very little noticed; but it was equally easy to eclipse the light of the sun as to destroy religious principle in the mind of man.

In the adoption of these unwise measures, we find nothing said about conformity to the gospel of Christ—nothing concerning affectionate persuasion as the only legitimate means of promoting it; but the whole betrayed the principle, and breathed the spirit, of compulsion and persecution, with the view of enforcing conformity to the prayer-book! In accordance with these frightful announciations, the puritan Reformers were daily cited into the spiritual courts to suffer the rigorous execution of the penal laws, for the benefit of doctors and proctors, and other ravenous officers; they were obliged to long attendance at enormous charges, and then suspended, deprived, or cast into prison. The pursuivant was paid according to the number of miles he travelled; and the fees were exorbitant, which the prisoner was required to pay before he could be discharged. The method of proceeding was dilatory and vexatious, and their persecutors seldom called any witness to prove their accusations, but usually tendered the oath *ex officio*, to answer the interrogatories of the court; and if he refused the oath, he was examined without it, and convicted upon his own confession.

A modern writer, decidedly adverse to the puritans, has furnished the following sketch of their sufferings: "The puritan ministers were hunted out of their churches; their books were suppressed by the arbitrary will of the queen; they were treated harshly in all civil matters; they were constantly called before the detestable Star Chamber; they were treated with contumely and ridicule; the members of their congregations were dragged before the High-commission for listening to their prayers and sermons; and whenever any one refused to conform to the doctrines of the establishment, he was committed to prison. There were not wanting instances of persons being condemned to imprisonment

for life, and numerous were the cases in which whole families of the industrious classes were reduced to beggary by these persecutions." He adds, that "fines, imprisonment, and the gibbet continued to do their work in the vain attempt of the church and the government to put down opinion by these insufficient arms!"* This was grinding nonconformists to the very bone!

Persecution is usually inconsistent, and always injurious. Did not Queen Elizabeth engage in open war against men whose holy principles and conscientious scruples were incomparably dearer to them than royal favour and worldly emolument? Were they not arraigned and punished for refusing to place their understandings and consciences under the control of those in power? Who, then, were guilty of misdemeanor, the persecuted or the persecutors? Elizabeth is said to have managed her authority with *discretion* and vigour, by observing two maxims, "Never to force men's consciences," and "Never to suffer factious practices to go unpunished!"† An eminent writer reminds us that it required no great sagacity to perceive the inconsistency and dishonesty of persons who, dissenting from almost all Christendom, would suffer none to dissent from themselves—who demanded freedom of conscience, but refused to grant it to others—who urged reason against the authority of one opponent, but authority against the reasons of another! Bonner, our author adds, acted at least in accordance with his own principles.‡

An historian often cited insinuates that the deplorable state of the church was "occasioned in a great measure by unhappy controversies;" whereas he would have discovered greater candour and justice, if he had lamented the ill state of ecclesiastical affairs as giving occasion to controversy. The miserable condition of the church is furnished by his own pen: "Churchmen heaped many benefices upon themselves, and resided upon none, neglecting their cures; many of them alienated their lands, made unreasonable leases, and wastes of their woods, and granted reversions and advowsans to their wives and children, or to others for their own use. Churches ran greatly into dilapidations and decay, were nasty and filthy, and indecent for God's worship. Among the laity

* Pictorial Hist. vol. ii. p. 636, 746. † Echard's Hist. p. 415.
‡ Macaulay's Essays, vol. i. p. 433.

there was little devotion. The Lord's-day was greatly profaned, and little observed. The common-prayers were not frequented. Some lived without any service of God at all. Many were heathens and atheists. The queen's own court was an harbour of epicures and atheists, and a kind of lawless place, because it stood in no parish. Which things made good men fear some heavy judgments were impending over the nation."* In addition to these extreme grievances, the evils of patronage contributed in no slight degree to increase the deplorable state of the church. We are reminded "that patrons searched not the universities for the most fit pastors, but they posted up and down the country for the most gainful chapman, and he who had the biggest purse to pay *largely*, not he who had the best gifts to preach *learnedly*, was presented."†

This exhibits an affecting, but true picture. The nation was, however, much more alarmed at the prospect of the queen's marriage with the Duke of Anjou, a man of dissolute life, and a notorious Roman Catholic.‡ All true protestants were filled with terror at the proposed match, and many puritans openly protested against it, dreading the consequences of a protestant *body* under a popish *head*. Though the treaty was broken off, yet another commenced to unite the queen with the Duke D'Alencon, another zealous catholic. Efforts were made by several distinguished persons to dissuade her Majesty from the proposed marriage, while others seemed disposed to favour the match, among whom was the Lord Treasurer Burghley. This great statesman was not rash and hasty in the adoption of his opinion; but, having considered the legality of the marriage as a point of signal importance, and being unwilling to rest the decision of so weighty a matter on his own judgment, he sought the advice of learned divines, requesting their sentiments according to the word of God.

At this particular juncture, Mr. Cartwright, having received pressing letters from his beloved friends Wyburn, Fulke, Deering, Lever, and Fox, returned from exile,§ when the lord treasurer solicited his opinion on this question, so momentous to the welfare of the nation. The question proposed was, "Whether it was lawful for one professing the gospel to marry a papist?" Mr.

* Strype's Parker, p. 395. † Nares' Burghley, vol. iii. p. 87.
‡ Strype, vol. ii. p. 16, 34—43; Grindal, p. 242. § Clark, p. 18.

Cartwright answered decidedly in the negative; because he considered the match not only ill in itself, but also an exceeding great evil in the sight of God, as appeared from his holy word, which pronounced it unlawful for the Israelites to match with heathens. How great an evil it was in itself was manifest from God having put perpetual enmity between the seed of the woman and seed of the serpent; also from those places where God forbad the children of Israel holding familiar intercourse with the heathen; clearly showing against whom the decree of God was directly opposed. With those, therefore, true Christians might not have special fellowship so as to unite themselves with them in marriage. As to catholics being called Christians by common profession, and their being much better than idolatrous heathens, and less dangerous in this matter, both these points, being the substance of the treaty, had been sufficiently answered. "For my part," he added, "I am fully persuaded that it is directly forbidden in Scripture that any who profess religion according to the word of God should marry with those who profess religion after the manner of the Church of Rome."* It does not appear, however, what impression these sentiments produced on the mind of Burghley; but the marriage negociation was broken off, and the nation rescued from its fearful apprehensions.

On this subject, Mr. John Stubbs of Lincoln's Inn, whose sister Mr. Cartwright afterward married, published his famous book, entitled, "The Discovery of the Gaping Gulph, whereinto England is like to be swallowed by another French Marriage, if the Lord forbid not the Banns." The queen was so incensed at this publication that she immediately issued a proclamation to suppress the book, and to apprehend the author and printer. The lords of the council commanded Archbishop Grindal to convene the clergy, and require them not to meddle with secular matters as not appertaining to their profession.† Bishop Aylmer at the same time summoned the clergy of his diocese to appear at his palace, where he warned them not to meddle with the controversy concerning the real presence in the sacrament, nor with the points treated of in Stubbs' book against the queen's marriage, but use their best endeavours to suppress the dangerous publication.‡ The author

* Strype, vol. ii. p. 145—161, Appen. p. 31, 32. † Grindal's Remains, p. 411.
‡ Brit. Biog. vol. iii. p. 230.

and printer were presently apprehended, and sentence given against them, that their right hands should be cut off, according to an act of bloody Mary, "against the authors and publishers of seditious writings!"* Stubbs received this punishment in circumstances of great barbarity by a butcher's knife and mallet; and, immediately after his right hand was cut off, he pulled off his hat with his left, and exclaimed, "God save the Queen!" Page, the printer, having undergone similar punishment, exclaimed, "There lies the hand of a true Englishman!" This ghastly exhibition, so disgraceful to a civilized country, will never be forgotten.† The horrid spectacle excited the warmest sympathy of the people, who not only admired Stubbs' abilities, learning, and piety, but also appreciated his views of the Reformation, and applauded his loyalty to Queen Elizabeth. The tragedy being finished, Stubbs was committed to the Tower, where he remained a long time. Having suffered nearly a year's imprisonment, he addressed a petition to Lord Burghley, written with his left hand, in which he prayed his lordship to be "a honourable and helping hand" to obtain her Majesty's royal heart for his release from the heavy bonds of her indignation." Mrs. Stubbs at the same time presented an heart-rending petition to the queen; but these petitions were unavailing, and Stubbs was still a prisoner towards the close of this year.‡ Notwithstanding all this severity, his book was very far from being a virulent libel, as some persons have unjustly represented. The work was written in a sensible and judicious manner, exhibiting the author's unfeigned loyalty and affection towards Queen Elizabeth; and he afterward proved himself to be a loyal and worthy subject, and a valiant commander in Ireland.§ The opinion formed of Stubbs may be known from Lord Burghley's making choice of him some years after to answer one of Cardinal Allen's publications.‖

* Chalmers, vol. xxviii. p. 485.

† Kennet's Hist. vol. ii. p. 487; Zouch's Sydney, p. 133.

‡ Lansdowne MSS. vol. xxxi. art. 12, 19. § Hallam, vol. i. p. 250.

‖ Ellis' Original Letters, p. 41.

CHAPTER III.

REPLY TO WHITGIFT'S ANSWER TO THE ADMONITION.

The foregoing chapter contained a detail of Dr. Whitgift's triumph over Mr. Cartwright, with the method he adopted to promote the welfare of the church. His zealous exertions, as he no doubt anticipated, were not long unrewarded. He had been preferred to the rectory of Feversham, to a prebend in the cathedral of Ely, and to the mastership of Trinity College; but Archbishop Parker, the constant patron of such men, furnished him with a dispensation to hold another benefice, and, to remunerate his past services, and stimulate his future triumphs, he presented him to the deanery of Lincoln.*

While the puritan Reformers endured extreme sufferings,† the controversy against arbitrary power was conducted by the use of other weapons. Mr. Cartwright had not hesitated to charge Dr. Whitgift with oppressive severity, which the latter attempted to refute. Soon after Mr. Cartwright's departure from Cambridge was published "An Admonition to the Parliament, for the Reformation of Church Discipline;" to which were annexed Beza's Letter to the Earl of Leicester, and Gaulter's to Bishop Parkhurst. The work contains the character of a Christian church; the manner of electing ministers, with their several duties, and their equality in government. It exposes the corruptions of the hierarchy, and the arbitrary proceedings of the bishops, and concludes with a petition to both houses of parliament that discipline more consonant to the word of God might be established by law.

The attempt to procure an establishment according to the opinions of the puritans was indefensible. With unanswerable

* Strype's Parker, p. 332; Whitgift, p. 23. † Chalmers, vol. viii. p. 326.

evidence they exposed the gross ecclesiastical abuses, especially the tyranny and persecution by which they were upheld. There is reason to fear, however, if the desired object had been obtained from the parliament, the scheme would have been established by compulsory and persecuting enactments, in opposition to the authority and instructions of Jesus Christ. As already stated, the coercion of religion by temporal penalties is at open variance with the principles and intentions of Christianity, and is the worst and most dangerous feature of antichrist.

Numerous mistaken writers, both of former and later times, have fathered the Admonition on Mr. Cartwright, one of whom affirms not only that Mr. Cartwright was chief of the party who sought to obtain the Geneva church government, but also, to attain this object, that he exposed himself to many dangers both of *liberty* and *life*, appearing to justify himself and his party in many remonstrants, especially the "Admonition to the Parliament." This author adds that Mr. Cartwright was the author and publisher of the "Admonition" printed in 1572, which came out with the approbation of the whole party.* Authors have been unsparing in almost every kind of abuse against Mr. Cartwright for this publication; whereas he was not the author, but Mr. John Field and Mr. Thomas Wilcocks, for which they were committed to Newgate, where they suffered a long and severe confinement. An author already cited, who has very little regard to correctness, having styled Mr. Cartwright "the great English puritan," gravely, but erroneously, states that he often composed admonitions, "in flight and in exile," and that they were published in the year 1574!† The extreme sufferings of the two authors awakened the sympathy and affection of their brethren, who kindly visited them in prison, among whom were Drs. Fulke, Humphrey, and Wyburn, and Messrs. Lever, Crowley, Deering, and Cartwright. ‡

The publication of the Admonition created considerable alarm, especially in the minds of the bishops who had been Reformers, but who were become opponents of reform. It might have been supposed that some vast conspiracy existed for blowing up the hierarchy; but the reader may smile when reminded that the

* Walton's Lives, p. 250, 295. † D'Israeli's Charles I. vol. iii. p. 266.
‡ Strype's Parker, p. 413.

occasion of all this alarm was the publication of this solitary pamphlet! The impression on the minds of the right reverend fathers will best appear from their own statements. Bishop Cox, alluding to this publication, said, "You have learned what confusion has been occasioned in our ill-constituted church by some factious and heady men, who in their writings condemn and pull in pieces the whole economy of our church, and bring all the bishops and other ministers into incredible disfavour with the people, and also with the magistrates and nobility! They even reject this order as being of no use to the church of Christ, and are striving by every means in their power that it may be altogether abolished. Their object is to revive the ancient presbytery of the primitive church, and to establish an equality among ministers!" Bishop Pilkington, considered more moderate than others, said, "Our whole ecclesiastical polity, discipline, the revenues of the bishops, ceremonies or public forms of worship, liturgies, vocation of ministers, and the ministration of the sacraments,—all these are openly attacked from the press, and that they are not to be endured in the church of Christ." Bishop Horn accused the authors of the Admonition of "drawing away the people, maddened by their follies, through every vain variety of opinion, or rather madness of error, into what they call *purity*." Bishop Sandys, having stated how "sadly tossed" was the church, and how "wretched was its condition," added, "New orators are rising up among us—foolish young men, who, while they despise authority, and admit of no superior, are seeking the complete overthrow and rooting up of our whole ecclesiastical polity, and are striving to shape for us I know not what new platform of a church." Yet he hoped "this new fabric of discipline would shortly fall to pieces." *

The Admonition was followed by three other treatises, addressed to Dr. Whitgift. The first was introductory to the two others. The second was "An Exhortation to the Bishops to deal brotherly with their brethren." The third was "An Exhortation to the Bishops and Clergy to answer a little Book that came forth in the last Parliament." † These publications were peculiarly seasonable. It could not be supposed that men would boldly impeach a powerful hierarchy, without calculating the probable consequences; nor

* Zurich Letters, p. 285, 287, 295, 311, 320. † Biog. Brit. vol. vii. p. 4238.

would they place themselves in the front of danger, without the prospect of measures being followed up by active and duly qualified auxiliaries. Mr. Cartwright was precisely in this position; but the undertaking was hazardous. Having frequently visited those who were already great sufferers, the sight of their distress could not assuage his sympathy for the occasion of their sufferings. Whosoever had the courage to engage in this cause would be sure to bring upon himself the utmost weight of vindictive authority; yet Mr. Cartwright ventured to publish "The Second Admonition to the Parliament," which commenced with an address "to the godly readers."

"We have cast our accounts," says he, "who bend ourselves to deal in these matters, not only to abide hard words, but also hard and sharp dealings for our labour; and yet shall we think our labour well bestowed if, by God's grace, we attain but to give some light of that reformation of religion which is grounded upon God's word, and to have somewhat opened the deformities of our English Reformation, which highly displeaseth God. We should be sorry to offend, especially any good Christian; for our purpose is not to purchase more hatred or get more enemies: God knoweth we seek to do good.

"What then is there in our books that should offend any who seem to be godly? Some may say either there is much amiss in our books, or we have a great deal of wrong offered us by such men as would seem to be the fathers of all true godliness. The authors of the former have been, and still are, hardly handled, being sent close prisoners to Newgate, next door to hanging; and by some of no mean estimation it hath been reported that it had been well for them if they had been sent to Bedlam to save their lives, as if they had been in peril of being hanged: and another prelate said, if they had been of his ordering, Newgate should have been their surety, and fetters their bonds. Now that they have had the law, and are close prisoners, they are found neither to have been traitors nor rebels; and if it had been tried by God's law, they would not have been found to have offended against that law at all, but to have deserved praise of that law and the church of God. What, I pray, have they done amiss? They have pubilshed that the ministry of England is out of square. I need not ask what

they have answered to that book; for they have answered only that it is a *foolish* book: but with godly, wise men, I trust that will not be taken for sufficient answer.

"If they will still answer us with cruelty and persecution, we will keep ourselves out of their hands as long as God shall give us leave, and content ourselves with patience, if God suffer us to fall into their hands. We humbly beseech her Majesty not to be stirred against us by such men as will endeavour to bring us more into hatred, who will not care what to lay to our charge so they oppress us and suppress the truth. They will say, we despise authority and speak against sovereignty; but what will not envy say against the truth? Her Majesty shall not find better subjects in her land than those who desire a right Reformation, whose goods, bodies, and lives are most assured to her Majesty and to their country." In the body of the work Mr. Cartwright observes, "No preacher may without great danger utter all truth comprised in the word of God. The laws of the land, the Book of Common-prayer, the queen's injunctions, the commissioners' advertisements, the bishops' late canons, Linwood's provincials, every bishop's articles in his diocese, my lord of Canterbury's sober caveats in his licenses to preachers, his high court prerogative, or grave fatherly faculties,—these together, or the worst of them, as some of them are too bad! may not be broken or offended against, but with more danger than to offend against the Bible! To these subscribing, and subscribing again, and the third subscribing, are required: for these, preachers and others are indicted, fined, imprisoned, excommunicated, banished, and have worse things threatened them: and the Bible must have no further scope than by these it is assigned! Is this to profess God's word? Is this a reformation? We say the word of God is above the church; then surely it is above the English church, and above all the books now rehearsed. If it be so, why are they not overruled by it, and not it by them?"

The publication of the *first* Admonition gave occasion to one of the most famous controversies that ever arose in the English church, wherein Mr. Cartwright took a distinguished part, the leading peculiarities of which must be presented to the attention of the reader. The Admonition is stigmatized as "a dangerous book, which rose openly and insolently against the church," and is said

to have been written with much bitterness, and intended to overthrow the ecclesiastical state, and that its principal design was to undermine and ruin the Reformation!* The author cited adds that, through the connivance and *favour* shown to the puritans, they had abundantly increased in number, and greatly improved in their principles against the Established Church. It may be asked, Was there either connivance or favour in being cast out of the university or cast into Newgate? But he adds that they condemned the office occupied by bishops as antichristian; that they attempted to overthrow the whole constitution of the Established Church, and set up a more scriptural government; and that the Admonition excited alarm both at court and in the church, the great design of which, it is untruly affirmed, was to subvert the worship and episcopal government of the church of England!†

This representation would lead some persons to conclude that these puritan divines were very rebellious subjects, and that they intended by force and violence to destroy the episcopal establishment, and to erect their own scheme of discipline. But is there the least particle of evidence of the one or the other? The unadulterated page of history at once not only acquits them of every such imputation, but also applauds them as peaceable and loyal subjects, and for their commendable efforts to promote reform. They approached the bishops, the parliament, and her Majesty, with humble *petitions* for a redress of most painful grievances, and for a reformation of ecclesiastical abuses; and the learned historian who condemns them also acquaints them of the very charges which he brings against them. "They were not enemies," says he, "but *friends* of the Reformation; and they disapproved of certain constitutions and practices, but laboured to obtain a purer Reformation!"‡ Were they then deserving of censure or of commendation? The Admonition has been incorrectly styled "a political pamphlet;" but, at the time of its publication, Day the printer, and Toy the bookseller, assisted by a pursuivant and other officers, by the appointment of the bishops, endeavoured to seize the books at the press, but were probably disappointed. The Admonition furnished a detail of what the puritans wished to see reformed; but it contained no

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 27, 28. † Strype's Parker, p. 347, 362; Aylmer, p. 56.
‡ Strype, vol. ii. p. 185.

rebellious principles, no appeal to force, no compulsory measures whatsoever,—it was simply a *petitionary address* to the two houses of parliament, humbly submitting to them the great need of reforming the church, and exhibiting the obvious occasion of the sufferings inflicted upon worthy ministers of Jesus Christ.

This publication marked an important era in the history of puritanism, as well as in the life of Mr. Cartwright. The hour for liberal concessions had been suffered to pass away; the archbishop's intolerant temper had taught men to question the authority that opposed them, till the battle was no longer to be fought for a tippet and a surplice, but for the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, interwoven with the temporal constitution.* The Admonition, when first published, obtained an extensive circulation, and soon passed through at least four editions, notwithstanding the zealous efforts of the bishops to suppress it. Archbishop Parker applied to Lord Burghley, and united with his brethren of the High-commission in pressing the Lord Mayor and Alderman of London to apprehend the various parties concerned in the publication: but they could procure no assistance; so these efforts were unsuccessful. The venerable primate, in one of his letters to Burghley, having complained that the Admonition was still abroad, added, "Since the first printing, it hath been twice printed, and now with additions, whereof I send your honour one of them." He wrote to the lord mayor and certain aldermen to lay in wait for the printer and corrector of the press; but, he added, "I fear they deceive us: they are not willing to disclose this matter!"† The primate was suspicious of these persons acting with duplicity, and of their unwillingness to make any discovery. To suppress the obnoxious publication, and prevent the diffusion of its principles, he adopted a course far more rational as well as more equitable, and appointed Dr. Whitgift as the most suitable person to publish a refutation of it.‡ In the prosecution of the undertaking, Whitgift had the assistance of Bishop Cox and Bishop Cooper, with other learned divines, especially Archbishop Parker, who favoured him with a regular correspondence and all the aid in their power. The archbishop noted down the objectionable passages in the Admo-

* Hallam, vol. i. p. 252. † Lansdowne MSS. vol. xv. art. 39.

‡ Strype's Whitgift, p. 27.

nition, furnished Whitgift with his collections, and revised his manuscript before it was sent to the press.* The work, with this co-operation, might not be unfitly considered as a joint publication.

The authors of the Admonition, we are told, erected their superstructure on what Dr. Whitgift denominated "two rotten pillars and false principles." One was "that we must of necessity have the same kind of church government as that in the time of the apostles, and as it is expressed in the Scriptures." The other is, "that we may not in any wise retain in the church any thing that hath been abused under the pope."† This writer is certainly correct in stating the deep solicitude to have the church of Christ governed by the laws and instructions of Christ, and not by the traditions or opinions of men. It is unnecessary to inquire how far this pillar is *rotten*, or whether it be altogether *false;* but the account of the second point, being extremely erroneous, is calculated to mislead the unwary. The persecuted ministers were willing to retain every thing that was *necessary* to the worship of God, though it had been used in the time of popery; but they anxiously sought that everything should be cast out of the church when founded in superstition, or tending to lead the people astray from God. This exactly accorded with the reiterated sentiments of the leading Reformers, as already stated on the best authority.

Whitgift's performance is entitled, "An Answere to a certen Libel, intituled A Admonition to the Parliament," quar. 1572; and his method is unexceptionable. He professedly transcribes, in regular order, the whole of the Admonition; and then subjoins his answer to every successive paragraph! His work is denominated a "learned answer," and an "excellent book, containing a very satisfactory vindication of the church of England."‡ These are certainly high commendations of the work; and, on the supposition that it possessed these admirable qualities, the man who dared to publish a reply ought to have been endowed with no common share of learning and abilities; and, when the nature of the dispute, and the severity of the time, are taken into the account, it must

* Biog. Brit. vol. vii. p. 4237; Whitgift, p. 32, 42; Strype, vol. ii. p. 185; Soames' Elizabeth, p. 209.

† Strype's Parker, p. 363. ‡ Paule's Whitgift, p. 19; Strype's Whitgift, p. 33.

have been a most hazardous enterprise. No one was thought so well qualified to furnish an answer as the learned Mr. Cartwright; and, at the recommendation of his friends, and some say they made choice of him by lot,* he undertook the task, and published his work, entitled "A Replye to an Answere made by M. Doctor Whitgift againste the Admonition to the Parliament," quar. 1573. The copy now before me is closely and neatly printed in black letter, containing two hundred and twenty-four pages in quarto, but without date or printer's name, which seems to be the edition printed about 1589. This is styled a "masterpiece of controversy."†

Mr. Cartwright, in the dedication "to the Church of England, and all that love the truth in it," after having endeavoured to clear the subject of the reproach cast upon it, states the following reasons for engaging in this important service.

"I wish," says he, "that this controversy had been with the papists, or with others, if any can be, more pestilent and professed enemies of the church; for then it would have been less grief to write, and more convenient to promote that which I desire. As the very name of an enemy kindles the desire of fighting, and stirreth up the care of preparing the furniture for the war, so the name of a brother slackeneth that courage and abateth that carefulness which should be employed in defence of the truth. But, seeing the truth ought not to be forsaken for any man's cause, I enforced myself, considering that the Lord might lay it to my charge that I was not so ready as I ought to have been to publish the truth; he might more justly condemn me if, being oppugned and slandered by others, I should not, according to that measure which he hath given me, and according to my small ability, defend it and deliver it from that evil report which some endeavour to bring upon it. This cause is charged with being an enemy to magistrates and the commonwealth. If it be enough to accuse without proof—to affirm and show no reason, innocency itself will not be guiltless. This doctrine was in times past, even by their confession who write against it, a friend to princes and magistrates, when they were its enemies; and can it be an enemy to

* Worthies, part ii. p. 27.

† Herbert's Ames, vol. iii. p. 1634; Cunningham's Lives, vol. ii. p. 211.

them who are now its friends? It helped to uphold commonwealths when governed by tyrants; and can it injure them when governed by godly princes?"

Mr. Cartwright, in reply to Whitgift's unjust censures, said, "Your first object is to place us, whether we will or not, in the camp of the Anabaptists, to the end you may draw all godly persons from aiding us, and have the sword to supply the insufficiency of your pen. If we be found in their camp—if we be such disturbers of the quiet estate of the church, defacers of such as be in authority, maintainers of licentiousness and lewd liberty, as you charge us, we refuse not those punishments which our crimes deserve. All that you allege of the Anabaptists is true: God be praised, no part of it is true in us! If the church be disquieted by the agitation of these questions, that disquietude ariseth from the rejection of the truth. We seek to promote our own views, not in a tumultuous manner, but by *humble suit* to those to whom the redress of grievances appertains, and by teaching as our callings will suffer. As to magistrates and those in authority, we acknowledge the lawfulness, necessity, and singular commodity of them: we commend them in our sermons, and we pray for them as for those on whose good estate depends the flourishing condition of the commonwealth and the church. We love them as our fathers; we fear them as our lords and masters; and we obey them in the Lord, and for the Lord. If in any thing we do not according to that which is commanded, it is because we cannot be persuaded in our consciences that we may do it: for which we are ready to render our reasons out of God's word; and, if that will not serve, we are willing to submit ourselves to that punishment which shall be awarded against us. Herein we first call the Lord God to witness our meaning; and then we refer ourselves to the consciences of all men in the sight of God."*

Having made these preliminary observations, it will be proper to state the principal subjects brought under discussion, so as to exhibit to the reader the leading principles and peculiarities of the controversy, which will be imbodied in the following positions, given as near as practicable in the words of the disputants:—

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 8—13.

1. *Standard of judgment.*

The two divines, not agreeing by what criterion to try the points at issue, found it extremely difficult to bring the dispute to a favourable termination. Whitgift contended that, though the Scriptures constituted a perfect rule of faith, they were not intended for the government of the church; but that this government was changeable, and might be regulated by the views and intentions of the civil authority. He denied the divine right of every ecclesiastical system, and reduced all Christian ministers to a subordination to the secular power, contrary to the domination assumed in later times. He boldly affirmed that there was not any form of church government prescribed in Scripture, and that ecclesiastical government was to be regulated by the government of the state. Instead of reducing the ecclesiastical policy, therefore, to the simplicity and authority of Scripture, the doctor, being guided by the opinions of former times, declared that, if either godly councils or ancient fathers were at all regarded, the controversy would presently be decided. He added that the most learned of the fathers, as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and others, affirmed that even from the time of the apostles the church exercised authority in such matters, and had observed various orders and ceremonies not mentioned in Scripture.*

Mr. Cartwright, on the contrary, advocated the cause of divine truth, as the only legitimate authority in matters pertaining to the worship of God. He contended, in direct opposition to the doctor, that the holy Scriptures constituted the only safe standard of religious government, as well as of Christian doctrine, and that the church of Christ—or that kingdom which is not of this world—ought at all times to be regulated by them. The Bible, in his opinion, contained the whole of the Christian religion. Though he could appeal to the most worthy of the ancient fathers in support of his opinions, yet he would consult the Bible *alone,* as the true and infallible standard of judgment in these and all other matters, wishing to reduce everything in religion to the apostolic practice. The less religion was incumbered with human traditions, the more, in his opinion, would it resemble the simplicity of Christ.

* Whitgift's Answere, p. 22, 23.

He therefore reminded the doctor how unfitly he had dedicated his book to the church, since he had so collected it from the fathers that a sentence of Scripture was very rarely found in it. If he would have the church believe him, he ought to have settled their judgment and faith in the Scriptures, as the only foundation of the church; instead of which, he led them into ways where they could not follow him. None but the learned, who had the books which he cited, could know that the things alleged were true; and, if they could know, they had nothing on which to rest their judgment and quiet their conscience.* He moreover reminded Whitgift that he introduced Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and others, as dumb persons, and they went away without saying any thing. If they could have said any thing on these matters of controversy, no doubt the doctor would have made them speak. As he places the greatest strength of his cause in antiquity, he would not have passed by Justin, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Cyprian, being so ancient, and taken up Augustine, who was a long time after them; and, if the godly councils could have helped here, it discovered little wisdom to leave them and take Augustine. He might have learned that, amongst the authorities of men, the testimony of many is better than one; and that this is a general rule, that, as the judgment of some notable person is more regarded in a matter of debate than that of one of the common sort, so the judgment of a council, where many learned men are gathered together, carrieth with it more evidence of truth than the judgment of one man.

The reader will observe, throughout his book, that the doctor has well provided against being taken in the trap of misquoting the Scriptures; "for, with one or two exceptions, we hear continually of St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, Dionysius Areopagite, and Clement, instead of Isaiah and Jeremiah, St. Paul and St. Peter, with the rest of the prophets and apostles. I cannot therefore tell with what face we can call the papists, from their antiquity, councils, and fathers, to a trial by the holy Scriptures, who, in the controversies among ourselves, fly so far from them, and so nearly banish them from deciding all these controversies. If it be a sufficient proof to

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 103.

affirm that such a doctor said so, or such a council decreed it, there is scarcely anything so true but I can impugn, or so false but I can make true: by their means the principal grounds of our faith may be shaken."

Mr. Cartwright, deeply interested in his subject, wrote like one who had embarked all his interests in the cause, and who, instead of regretting, gloried in what he had done, as his highest honour, and best proof of his fidelity to God. He forcibly recommended, that the cause might be looked upon with a single eye, without the mist of partiality; be heard with an indifferent ear, without the intermixture of prejudice; the arguments on both sides be weighed, not with the changeable weights of custom among men, but with the just balance of the incorruptible and unchangeable word of God.* His principles were dignified and honourable, showing the strength of his intellect and the independence and fortitude of his mind, in contrast with the spirit and opinions of the times.†

It will not be deemed unseasonable to state the sentiments of a learned dignitary of the Church of England. "In those days," says Archdeacon Blackburn, "nothing was thought to be sufficiently confirmed by Scripture testimonies, without additional vouchers from the ancient worthies of the church; and, accordingly, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Austin, and Jerome, regularly took their places on the same bench of judgment with Paul, Peter, James, and John. In process of time, some particular persons began to see into this mistake. In our own country, the learned Cartwright, in his dispute with Whitgift, took the courage to appeal from the authority of the fathers, and to prescribe them narrower limits in the province of determining religious controversies. How this would be received in those days might be easily conjectured without particular information. The terms in which Cartwright had characterised these venerable doctors were collected together in a

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 7, 29.

† The reader may consider it a little remarkable that Dr. Whitgift maintained that God's revealed will and the will of the magistrate constituted the double rule of obedience, the former relating to doctrine, the latter to government and ceremonies; but that the learned Hooker maintained that God's revealed will and his approval formed jointly the rule of human obligation; yet that the learned Chillingworth maintained "that the Bible, and the Bible only, was the religion of Protestants!"—*Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, vol. iii. p. 152; *Biog. Brit.* vol. iii. p. 517.

book of Bancroft's, and set off with tragical exclamations, as if they had been little less than so much blasphemy!" * †

2. *Election of Ministers.*

The method of providing ministers for the church of Christ, and the persons by whom they ought to be elected to their office, occasioned frequent discussion among the learned, even from the earliest dawn of the Reformation, and their conclusions usually accorded with the premises they laid down. Whitgift and Cartwright unfortunately placed their arguments on very different grounds, and consequently drew very different conclusions. The doctor with great zeal advocated the power and authority of bishops, and with great confidence maintained that they possessed the sole power of appointing ministers to their respective congregations; and, appealing to the fathers, he affirmed that the order and election of ministers belonged exclusively to bishops.‡

Mr. Cartwright endeavoured to repel the doctor's statement, and showed his extreme inconsistency. He said, "You would prove that this election of ministers by one man was the practice in the time of the apostles; but you have forgotten who before said that election by the church was the practice not only in the time of the apostles, but also in the time of Cyprian: now you say otherwise. If the election of the minister by the church agree so well with the time of persecution, and when there is no Christian magistrate, how cometh it to pass that in those days when persecution was so hot, and there were no such magistrates, that St. Paul would have the election by one man, and not by the church? If it be

* Blackburn's Works, vol. v. p. 163, 164. † The sentiments of the learned Bishop Jewel were in agreement with those of Mr. Cartwright. He said, "We make a reasonable request, that God may be umpire in his own cause; and that all our controversies may be judged and tried by the holy Scriptures. In desiring to restore the church of God to its first integrity and purity, we would not seek any other foundation to build upon than that which was laid by Jesus Christ and his apostles. The church is to be shown out of the sacred Scriptures; and whatever cannot derive itself from them is not the church! In the cause of God, we desire to stand or fall by the judgment of God *alone*. We know that all we teach is true, and we cannot offer violence to our consciences, nor give testimony against God: if we deny any part of the gospel of Jesus Christ before men, He will in like manner deny us before the Father; and, if there be any that will be offended, and cannot bear the doctrine of Christ, they are blind, and leaders of the blind."—*Jewel's Apologie and Defence.*

‡ Whitgift's Answere, p. 46.

St. Paul's commandment that the bishop only should choose the minister, why do you make it an indifferent thing, and a thing to be varied as times vary, being an express commandment? Thus, you see, you throw down with one hand what you build up with the other.

"You say it is the general consent of all the learned fathers that the bishop ought to choose ministers for the people. You acquaint my ears with such bold and untrue affirmations, as though you had all the fathers by heart; whereas, if a man would measure you by your skill in them here showed, he would hardly believe you had read a tenth part of them. Are all the learned fathers then of that mind? Had that been the case, I think you would have been better advised than to have set down *only one* of them; therefore you give me occasion to suspect that, because you cite only one, you know of no more. Let us now see what your one witness will depose in this matter. You have done more craftily than justly in having altered Jerome's words. For when he saith, 'Wherein doth a bishop differ from an elder, but only in ordaining,' you say, 'A bishop doth excel all other ministers.' I appeal to your conscience whether you did not on purpose change Jerome's sentence, because you would not let the reader understand what difference there was between Jerome's bishops and those of our Lord. For then the bishop had nothing above an elder or other minister, but only the ordaining of ministers: now he hath a thousand parishes, while the minister has only one. The bishop now excommunicates, which the minister cannot do; and absolveth and receiveth into the church, which the minister cannot do. There are other things merely civil which the bishop doth, and which neither bishop nor other minister ought to do." *

He next reminded the doctor of his unwillingness to decide these controversies by the opinions of *men*, but by the *infallible word of God*, which, in his estimation, was the only safe standard of appeal in all things appertaining to religion and the worship of God. Although the doctor had affirmed, professedly on the authority of Jerome, that bishops had the election as well as the ordination of ministers, our divine from the same authority denied and refuted the sentiment; after which he informed his opponent that,

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 56—58.

notwithstanding his boasting of all the learned fathers being of his judgment, he had failed to show that even one of them was. Seeing then that the Scriptures teach that no minister should be thrust upon the church, and reason persuades the same thing; and the usage of the church hath been so from time to time, both in peace and in persecution, both under tyrants and godly princes; it cannot be without the high displeasure of Almighty God, and the great injury and oppression of the church, that one man should take this upon him which belongs to so many, or one minister that which pertains to more than one, especially where the advice of learned ministers may concur with the people's election or consent.*

3. *Officers of Christian Churches.*

The disputants were at variance concerning the officers belonging to the churches of Christ. The authors of the Admonition having shown that the Established Church appointed and maintained certain ecclesiastical officers not appointed by Jesus Christ, which they considered useless and burdensome to the church, Whitgift warmly replied, "You show your ignorance, and contemptuous stomachs. You have given sentence that the names of metropolitan, archbishop, and their offices, were devised by antichrist; that they were strange, and unheard of in Christ's church; that they were plainly forbidden in God's word; and that they were utterly, and with speed, to be removed. If you can prove all these points, it is time the church were transformed, and the whole of its government in this realm altered; but if you cannot prove them, then is it high time that such insolency should be repressed, and perturbers of churches and commonwealths removed!" To disprove the positions laid down in the Admonition, and confirm his own opinions, the doctor made copious extracts from the ancient canons, councils, and fathers.†

Mr. Cartwright here met his antagonist on open ground. He observed that the doctor bestowed "great cost and travail in digging about these ecclesiastical offices, and laying new earth to their roots, that they being half dead, if it were possible, might again be recovered and quickened; so because these trees mount so

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 58, 59. † Whitgift's Answere, p. 64—71.

high, and spread their branches so far, he would set down certain reasons to take away their superfluous top. Then let the whole practice of the church under the law be examined, and it will be found that every order in the ecclesiastical ministry was appointed by *the law of God;* and if there were any raised up for any extraordinary purpose, they had their calling confirmed from heaven by signs or miracles, or some clear testimony from the mouth of God, or by some extraordinary movings of the Spirit of God. So it appears that the ministry of the gospel ought to be from heaven, and not from men: from heaven, I say, and heavenly; because although it be executed by earthly men, and the ministers are also chosen by men like themselves, yet, because it is done by the word and institution of God, who hath ordained not only that the word should be preached, but also in what order and by whom it shall be preached, it may well be considered as coming from God.

"Neither the names nor the offices of archbishops nor archdeacons are in harmony with the ministry of the gospel; and, seeing that these functions are not in the word of God, it follows that they are of the earth, and so can do no good, but much harm, in the church of Christ. If any one will say that we do the church great injury because we tie her to certain orders of ministers, so that she may not devise new functions, both Christ and the church accuse him. Christ considers that much injury is done him; because by this means he is supposed not to have been sufficiently careful and provident of his church, in leaving the ministry, wherein consists the life of the church, and by which it is even begotten to God, so raw and imperfect that, by permitting it to be ordered by men, there is great danger of error, which he might have set out of all danger by speaking a word or two. Also the church rises against him; for he makes Christ less careful of her now than he was under the law. Tell me, is there in the whole volume of the Testament any kind or degree of ministry whereof God is not the certain and express author? Was there ever a man either so holy, or so wise, (I except Jeroboam and such persons,) that ever did so much as dream of instituting a new ministry? After the ark had wandered long in the wilderness, and was at length placed in Jerusalem, tell me if any office or title was ordained without the command of God, or whether there was any thing added or enjoined to

the offices of his appointment which was not prescribed by his holy word.

"In the tabernacle the church is expressly set forth. Moses, who was the overseer of the work, was a wise and godly man; the artificers that wrought it, Bazalael and Aholiab, were most cunning workmen; and yet the Lord left nothing to their will, but told them not only of the boards, the curtains, the apparel, but also the bars, the rings, the strings, the books, the besoms, the snuffers, and all things, the matter, and the form. As the temple was nearer the time of Christ, so it is a more lively expression of the church of God that now is. Solomon, the wisest man, did nothing in it, or for it, or for the vessels of the temple, or for the beauty of it, but according to the form that was enjoined upon him. And in the restoration of the temple, Ezekiel is witness how the angel, by the command of God, appointed the whole and all the parts to be done, both in the temple and the furniture.

"If the Holy Ghost did so carefully and curiously prescribe all these things in figures, how much more is it to be expected now that he hath performed this in truth? If in the shadows, how much more in the substance? If he have done this in earthly things which are perished, how can it be supposed that he hath not performed it in the heavenly things which abide for ever? And what are those times of which it was said, 'When the Messias cometh, he will tell us all things?' Is it likely that he who appointed not only the tabernacle and the temple, but the ornaments of them, would neglect not only the ornaments of the church, but that without which it cannot long stand? Shall we conclude that he who remembered the bars there, hath forgotten the pillars here? or that there he who remembered the pins, here forgot the master-builders? Should he there remember the besoms, and here forget archbishops if any had been needful? Could he there make mention of the snuffers to purge the lights, and here pass by the lights themselves? What is this but looking at small things and overlooking great things? Let it then be accounted a shame to say that the chief pillar and upholder of the church is not mentioned in Scripture.

"Those ministries, without which the church is fully builded and brought to perfection and complete unity, are not to be retained in

the church: but without the ministries of archbishops and others not mentioned in Scripture, the church may be fully builded and brought to perfection; therefore those ministries are not to be retained. That without these ministries the church of Christ may be complete appears from those officers appointed by Christ, 'For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' Learned writers have thus reasoned against the pope: that for as much as the apostles and prophets are sufficient for the building of the church; therefore there ought to be no pope. The argument and the conclusion are as strong against archbishops and others not of apostolic origin. For the same reason that the pope is cast away as a superfluous thing the archbishops and others are thrown out of the church, as excrescences, and no members of the body, but burdensome to it, and disfiguring it. And as you say that God gave no pope to his church; therefore the pope can do no good: so we say that God gave no archbishop to his church; therefore the archbishop can do no good.

"With what face then can you take the reigns of government out of the hands of the apostles, and put them into the hands of archbishops and archdeacons? What a perversion is this, that the ministries invented by men should be preferred to the ministries appointed and commanded by God! The apostles, forsooth, have in common with the archbishops and archdeacons the power of ministering the word and sacraments, of binding and loosing, and thus far as good as the archbishops and archdeacons: but in matters of discipline and order the apostles have nothing to do in the Church of England; but archbishops and archdeacons are above them, and better than they. If I would follow you in making so many exclamations, as, 'Oh, the impudence! Oh, the insolence!' with twenty others, you see I have occasion here and elsewhere. But I would not exclaim, especially when I should dispute; nor make outcries, instead of assigning reasons. If men may make and appoint new offices in the church of Christ, they must either give gifts for the discharge of them, or assure men that they shall have gifts from God whereby they may be able to discharge them. But they can neither give the gifts nor secure to them the gifts

that are necessary for the discharge of those functions; therefore they may not appoint new offices in the church of Christ." * †

4. *Clerical Habits.*

The imposition of habits engaged the attention of these disputants. Dr. Whitgift, addressing the authors of the Admonition, proposed these important questions: "May not the Christian magistrate, for order and decency, appoint a several kind of apparel, as well to ministers as to other states of men? Judges, sergeants, aldermen, and citizens are known by their apparel; and why may not ministers? are they not under subjection to civil laws and ordinances? ought they not to obey their governors in all things not against the word of God? But cap, gown, tippet, and others, you say, are popish and antichristian: this is only said, not proved. If you call it popish and antichristian because it was first invented by an antichristian pope, it is first to be considered whether that be true or not; then, if it be true, whether every thing so invented is of necessity to be abolished.

"It is certain," adds the doctor, "that this apparel of ministers, with which you find yourselves so much grieved, was appointed long before the Church of Rome declined from the purity of Christ's religion. Stephanus, Bishop of Rome, who lived in the year of our Lord 256, is said to have appointed this kind of apparel to ministers; neither are you able to show that any antichristian pope invented it. But admit that this apparel was borrowed of the Jews, or taken from the Gentiles, or invented by some antichristian pope, yet it followeth not that the same may not be well used in the church of Christ." ‡

To the doctor's statement, Mr. Cartwright replied, that "the cap, tippet, and surplice were not their principal objections against the hierarchy, although the churches beyond sea had been so informed,

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 82—88. † Mr. Hooker represents the word and approval of God as constituting the twofold rule of man's obedience; and that it is unnecessary "that every thing which is of God should be set down in holy Scripture;" adding, "that both the ordination of officers and the very institution of the offices may be truly derived from God, and approved of him, although they be not set down in Scripture!" All the evidence of truth contained in these statements consists of bold affirmation; and the momentous points, which ought to have been proved, still remain untouched. —*Hooker's Eccl. Polity*, vol. iii. p. 152.

‡ Whitgift's Answere, p. 55—62.

that their judgments might be the more easily obtained against them. We think it an attire unmeet for a minister of the gospel, especially the surplice, because such ceremonies are the more dangerous when mixed with the worship of God. The reasons why we refuse them are not as many are told, because we think there is any pollution in the things themselves, nor only because the papists have superstitiously used them, but because, having been abominably abused by them, they have no profit, but are hurtful, being monuments of idolatry; whereas to introduce and establish them, there should be some manifest profit to be derived from them. It is not enough to say, 'It is in its own nature indifferent,' therefore meet to be done; but, as the circumstances of the times and persons and profit or hurt of our brethren do require or not require, so must it be done or not be done. In those things which are called indifferent, God will have the use of them to be measured; first, that they promote his glory, then the profit of souls. To prevent offences, St. Paul concludes that a man may do that, in respect of himself, which is not lawful in respect of others. 'Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will not eat flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.'

"Many persons hold all antichristianity in such detestation that they cannot abide the least remnant of it; and, when they see the ministers of Christ wear these garments, they are grieved in their hearts, and they begin somewhat to fear lest this communicating with papists in apparel be not the easy way to admit other things when commanded. The minds of these brethren ought not to be lightly grieved; and, if the ministers wish to profit them, they must cut off all that would give an evil opinion of them. Seeing then that these ceremonies in apparel harden the hearts of the papists, and cause them to be more stiff in popery, hinder the weak from profiting in the knowledge of the gospel, grieve the minds of the godly, and are the occasion of an evil opinion of the ministers who use them, we think they ought to be removed, not only as unprofitable, but as hurtful, if not to the ministers themselves, yet to their people whom God has commanded them to regard in things indifferent.

"You ask, whether the Christian magistrate may not enjoin a distinct kind of apparel upon ministers? Either the cause is too

weak which you defend, or it hath an evil patron, who would so gladly shift it and change for another. Though that be granted which you demand, you cannot conclude your cause; and though the magistrate may command a distinct apparel, it does not follow that he may command this *popish* apparel; therefore what manner of argument is yours—the magistrate may command a several apparel, therefore he may command this? You see I might let you fish and catch nothing; but I am neither afraid nor ashamed to tell you the truth of that which you ask, so far at least as I am persuaded. It may be such kind of apparel as the magistrate commanding it, the minister of Christ may refuse it; or such it may be, that he may not refuse it. But whatsoever apparel it be, this commandment cannot exist without some injury done to the minister. Seeing that the magistrate doth allow him as a wise, learned, and discreet man, and trusts him with the government of his people in matters between God and them, it is somewhat hard not to trust him with the appointment of his own apparel. May it not be supposed that he has discretion to wear his own garments comely and in order, who is able to teach others how they should wear theirs?—that he should be able to do that by his wisdom and learning which others do without learning or any great store of wisdom?—that he should maintain order and decency in apparel, who hath learned in the school of Christ that which they do who had never any other schoolmaster than reason and common sense? And if any minister be found to be going dissolutely, then may the magistrate punish him according to the disorder of which he is guilty.

"Your conclusion is both uncertain and untrue that, from the time of the apostles, there hath been a distinct apparel for the ministers. The inquiry is not whether these things were first invented by papists, or, being devised by others, were afterward adopted by papists; but the case is that they have been used by the papists, as notes, and marks, and sacraments of their abominations. It will be said that the minister is to warn the people against the abuse of them, and against superstition. This is much the same as if one should be set to watch a child all the day, lest he hurt himself with a knife, when, by taking the knife out of his hands, the danger would cease, and the service of the man be better employed. So that although the church may appoint rites and

ceremonies, yet it cannot appoint those which have great incommodity and offence. Though they have all those properties which you recite, yet, if they be not edifying, if not for God's glory, if not comely and agreeable to the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, they may not be established. If the apparel be not expressly commanded by God, but a thing, as you say, *indifferent*, and is the cause of so many incommodities, and is so abused, it ought to be abolished; as in the case of the brazen serpent which was appointed by the Lord, and continued a profitable remembrance of God's wonderful goodness towards his people, was, nevertheless, beaten to powder, when it became an occasion of falling to the children of Israel."*†

5. *Bishops and Archbishops.*

The doctor, appealing to the decrees of councils, the opinions of the fathers, and the old popish canons, affirmed that those who were learned might easily understand that the names of metropolitans, archbishops, archdeacons, primates, patriarchs, and such-like, were most ancient, and approved by these authorities. He then adds, "Forasmuch as the original and beginning of these names *cannot* be found, it is to be *supposed* that they have their original from the apostles! According to St. Augustine, 'Those things that are not expressed in the Scriptures, and yet are by tradition observed by the whole church, come either from the apostles or from general councils: as the observance of Easter, the celebration of ascension, and the coming of the Holy Ghost.' Very unlearned and ignorant, therefore, are those who affirm these names to be antichristian.

* Cartwright's Replye, pp. 71—81. † It is admitted that the twentieth article of the church declares that "the church hath power to decree rites, and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith;" and Mr. Hooker, defending this power, says, "The spiritual power of the church being such as neither can be challenged by right of nature nor could by human authority be instituted, because the forces and effects thereof are supernatural and divine, we are to make no doubt or question but that from Him, who is the Head, it hath descended unto us that are the body now invested therewith." We can easily believe that no man can justly claim spiritual power, nor can it be instituted by human authority, as here avowedly stated; but we may certainly both doubt and question whether the Lord Jesus hath invested any man or body of men with this extraordinary qualification, for the simple reason here furnished, because it relates to subjects "supernatural and divine."—*Hooker's Eccl. Polity*, vol. iii. p. 4.

"It is the chief office of the archbishop to keep unity in the church, to compound contentions, to redress heresies, schisms, factions, to see that bishops and all the clergy under him do their duty! Jerome therefore saith that in the beginning a bishop and a priest were one; but after the rise of factions in religion, some holding for Paul, some for Apollos, some for Cephas, and some for Christ, it was decreed that one should be chosen to bear rule over the rest, to whom the chief care of the church should appertain, and by whom sects and schisms should be cut off!"*

Mr. Cartwright, in reply, shows the wide difference between bishops in the primitive church and those in modern times; and that, while the name was retained, the office and employment had undergone a very material alteration: but whether this alteration was at all acceptable to Christ, or of any real advantage to Christian churches, would certainly be questioned. "In the primitive church there was one bishop in every congregation: now one is over a thousand congregations. Then every bishop had a distinct church, where he preached and ministered the sacraments: now he hath none. Then he ruled one church, in common with its elders: now he ruleth a thousand by himself, shutting out the ministers to whom the government belongs. Then he ordained not any minister except he was first chosen by the presbytery and approved by the people of the place to which he was ordained: now he ordains where there is no place void, and of his own private authority, without either choice of presbytery or approbation of the people. Then he did not excommunicate nor receive the excommunicated, but by the sentence of the eldership and the consent of the people: now he does both.

"The bishops, contrary to the word of God, have got into their hands both the pre-eminence over ministers and the liberties of the church of God; but the offices wherein there is any labour they have transferred to other ministers. We cannot but consider how much the lordship, pomp, and stateliness of the bishops in our days differ from the simplicity of former times. Galerius Maximinus the emperor, to promote the idolatry and superstition to which he was addicted, chose the choicest magistrates to be priests; and, that they might be held in great estimation, gave them a train

* Whitgift's Answere, p. 64—70.

of men to follow them. The Christian emperors, concluding that the same thing would promote the Christian religion which had promoted pagan superstition, endeavoured to make bishops conformable to those idolatrous priests, and not inferior to them in wealth and outward pomp. Since therefore the fountains whence this pomp and stateliness of bishops were derived are so corrupt, I conclude that the thing itself which hath sprung from such fountains cannot be good."*†

The reader will here observe how near akin are the pope and the archbishop. "The office of the latter is very similar to that of the former; and the arguments which are brought against the archbishop are the same as those against the papacy. Those places from Cyprian, as alleged by the doctor, are alleged for the pope's supremacy, and make as much for the pope as for the archbishop. Although they be two heads, they both stand upon one neck; therefore those reformed churches which cut right struck them both off at one blow. Before, the doctor attempted to show the name without the office; and now he endeavours to show the office without the name: so that he can never make both the name and the office meet together.

"How comes it to pass that St. Paul, being a prisoner at Rome, and expecting every day to give up his last breath, commended to the church a perfect and absolute ministry; yet he made no men-

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 123—126. † The apostles, says Hooker, "were the first bishops of the church of Christ;" also that "bishops there have been always, even as long as the church of Christ hath been." He nevertheless adds, "The church indeed, for a time, continued without bishops." But how could they continue in this destitution if the apostles who planted them were their bishops? He does not, however, say whether they were lord-bishops, and had seats in legislative assemblies, or that they were pastors of separate churches. Although this author represents the appointment of bishops as the remedy provided by "the special providence of God" against certain irregularities in the churches, yet he admits that the bishops were guilty of encroachment and usurpation, and, "by sleights and cunning practices, they appropriated ecclesiastical power;" also that there was no remedy left, but all this was to be borne "as an helpless evil." Was not the remedy then worse than the disease? Though these evils, says he, "had an indirect entrance at first, it must needs, through continuance of so many ages as this hath stood, be made now a thing more natural to the church than that it should be opprest with the mention of contrary orders worn so many ages since quite and clean!" This is an extraordinary statement, as if age had purified corruption, and transformed error into truth! — *Hooker's Eccl. Polity*, vol. iii. p. 97, 158, 160, 161.

tion of an archbishop, but saith that this ministry is able to promote the perfect unity and peace of the church? Do not all these things speak, or rather cry aloud, that there was not so much as the step of an archbishop in the time of the apostles? And if you will say that the apostles ordained archbishops, as you have indeed said, and do now say again, when there is not one word in their writings, I pray you tell us how shall we keep out of the church the unwritten traditions of the papists? If what you say be true, I cannot tell what to answer them. Our answer to them is that the apostles have left a perfect and written rule of ordering the church; therefore we reject their traditions as superfluous and unnecessary. As the degree of archbishop is not only never mentioned in the Scriptures, but is manifestly opposed to them, it is too bold and hardy to fetch the pedigree of archbishop from the apostles' times, and even from the apostles themselves!

"It is said that by this ecclesiastical monarchy all things are kept in peace; whereas it hath been the cause of discord, and the well-spring of most horrible schism, as may be seen in the very decretals. But admit it were so; yet the peace which is without truth is more to be dreaded than a thousand contentions. If it be necessary for keeping the unity of the Church of England that one archbishop should be primate over all, why is it not equally necessary for keeping the unity of the universal church that there should be one bishop of *all Christendom;* unless it be more necessary that there should be one bishop over the universal church than over the Church of England, seeing it is more important that peace should be preserved, and schisms be avoided, in the universal church than in the particular Church of England?

"It will be said that no one is able to discharge the office of a bishop to the whole church; neither is there any one able to discharge the office of a bishop to the whole Church of England: for when those who have been most excellent in knowledge and wisdom, and most ready in doing and dispatching matters, being always present with their flocks, have found enough to do to rule and govern *one* congregation, how is he able to discharge his duty towards so *many thousands* of churches?

"If you take exception that, although he be absent, he may do this by under-ministers, as by archdeacons, chancellors, officials, commis-

sioners, and others, what do you say but that the pope, by his cardinals, legates, archbishops, and others, doth all these things? for with their hands he ruleth all, by their feet he is everywhere present, and with their eyes he seeth what is done in all places. Let them take heed, then, lest if they have a common defence with the pope, that they be not also joined nearer to him in this cause than they are aware of." Mr. Cartwright added, "It is, indeed, against my will that I am constrained to make such comparisons, not that there is a great diversity between the popedom and the archbishopric, but because there is so great a resemblance. I am persuaded there is a great difference in the persons who execute them, and I have conceived a good opinion of them; so I do most humbly beseech them, by the glory of God, by the liberty of the church purchased with the precious blood of Christ, and by their own salvation, that they would not retain such hard, excessive, and unjust dominion over the church of the living God. For if David, who was such a notable personage, and 'a man after God's own heart,' durst not bring into the church any orders or policies, not only not against the word of God, but not without the express command of God, who shall dare to be so bold as to take upon him the institution of the chief office of the church, and to alter the policy which God hath established by his servants the apostles?" *

6. *Authority of Princes in matters Ecclesiastical.*

From the dawn of the Reformation the great inquiry was frequently made, "Has the civil magistrate authority to establish religion and enforce it upon his subjects by compulsory acts?" On this great question, Dr. Whitgift maintained that, since there was no Christian magistrate in the time of the apostles, there could be no established church, and therefore that the state of the church was then *popular;* but that afterward, when there was a *Christian* magistrate, the church was to be established by human laws! This diversity in the state of the church, in his opinion, required a different kind of government in the church, and another kind of ordaining of ministers. Having made an appeal to the council of Laodicea, also to the sentiments of Ambrose, and to certain modern

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 99, 106, 107, 120.

writers, he asks, "I pray you what authority in these matters do you give to the civil magistrate? Methinks I hear you whisper that the prince hath no authority in ecclesiastical matters. I know it is the received opinion of some of you; and therein you shake hands with the papists and anabaptists!"*

Mr. Cartwright endeavoured to refute the doctor's statement, and to establish the opposite opinion on a permanent basis. "If there be no established churches because there is no Christian magistrate then the churches of the apostles were not established. But it is absurd to say that ministers now, with the help of the magistrate, lay surer foundations of the church, or build more wisely or substantially than did the apostles, who were the master-builders of the church of God. As for the beauty and consummation of the body of the church, seeing it consisteth in Jesus Christ, who is the Head, and always joined to it, I cannot see why the church under persecution should not be established, having both the foundation and the superstructure, as well as when it hath a Christian magistrate. If the magistrate, whom God hath sanctified to be a nurse to his church, were also the head of it, then the church could not be established without the magistrate; but we learn that although the godly magistrate be the head of the commonwealth, and a great ornament to the church, he is but a member of it. The church may be established without the magistrate so as that all the world and all the powers of hell cannot shake it, but it cannot expect outward peace and quietness without a godly magistrate; therefore the church, on these accounts, praiseth God, and prayeth for the magistrate by whom it enjoys these singular benefits. If you put such dark colours upon the apostles' church, it is no marvel if it ought not to be a pattern to us. But, O Lord! who can patiently bear this horrible disorder which is ascribed to the apostles? If you say it is Ambrose's opinion and not yours, unless you allow it, why do you bring it, and bring it to prove the difference of the apostles' times and these? Doth not the whole Scripture declare, and hath it not been proved, that no one took upon him the ministry of the word in the time of the apostles but by a lawful calling? What then is this but to cast dust and dirt upon the fairest and most beautiful image?—to make a smoaky,

* Whitgift's Answere, p. 45, 127.

disfigured, and evil proportioned image seem beautiful?—to overthrow the apostles' buildings of gold, silver, and precious stones; and to make a cottage of wood, straw, and stubble to be held in estimation, which could have none other standing? for this in effect you do, when, to uphold a corrupt custom, which was introduced by the tyranny of the pope, you endeavour to discredit, with such manifest untruths, those orders and institutions used in the time of the apostles."*

7. *Confirmation by a Bishop.*

The inquisitive reader will no doubt be gratified with the sentiments of the two divines on the service of confirmation as contained in the Book of Common-prayer, and as practised in the Church of England. Dr. Whitgift states his opinion in few words, but in such words as cannot easily be misunderstood. "Confirmation as now used," he affirms, "is most profitable, without all manner of superstition, most agreeable to the word of God, and in all points differing from the papistical manner of confirming children." He then adds, "Arrogancy maketh you so peevish that you can like nothing, be it ever so good!†

Mr. Cartwright reasons with the doctor on the various objectionable features in this service, and in a way that appeared most likely to produce conviction. "Tell me," says he, "why there should be any such confirmation in the Christian church, being brought in by the feigned decretals of the popes, and not one tittle of it to be found in the Scriptures. And, seeing it hath been so horribly abused, and is unnecessary, why ought it not to be utterly abolished? And this confirmation hath many dangerous points. The first step of popery in confirmation is the laying on of hands upon the head of the child, which strongly intimates the opinion that it is a sacrament; especially when it is said to be done 'according to the example of the apostles,' which is a manifest untruth, and taken from the popish confirmation. The second is that the bishop must be the only minister of it, by which the popish opinion, which esteems it above baptism, is promoted in the minds of the people: for, while baptism may be administered by the minister, but not confirmation, great cause of suspicion is given that baptism is not

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 51, 54, 192.

† Whitgift's Answere, p. 197.

so precious a thing as confirmation; especially as this was one of the principal reasons of establishing that wicked opinion in popery. The third is that, in the order of confirmation, the Book saith that, by the imposition of hands and prayer, the children receive strength and defence against all temptations; whereas there is no promise that, by the laying on of hands upon children, any such gift shall be conferred; and it maintains the popish distinction that the Spirit of God is given at baptism, and, in confirmation, the remission of sins!" All this the doctor confutes, by stigmatizing the authors of the Admonition "peevish and arrogant!!"*

The learned puritan recommended the doctor that, if he published a second edition of his book, it ought to be carefully revised and corrected; and, since it was full of errors and other faults, that, to save his reputation, and to promote the cause which he defended, a complete reorganization of the whole was indispensably necessary. If the work should be reprinted, he suggested that it would be well to polish those parts which were somewhat rude, to mitigate those which were too sharp, to make plain those which were obscure, and to correct those which were erroneous. Mr. Cartwright, in conclusion, showed the agreement of his opinions with those of the foreign reformed churches, on the important questions of ecclesiastical power and equality existing among ministers, which he thus expressed: "Christ most severely forbad his apostles and successors all claim of primacy and dominion, and gave an equal power and function to all the ministers of the church; and that from the beginning no one was preferred above another, saving only for order some one called them together, propounded matters to be discussed, and gathered voices." †

The particulars here enumerated contain the substance of this part of the controversy; yet numerous collateral circumstances were brought under discussion, which it was unnecessary to mention. Mr. Cartwright's learning was displayed in admirable subserviency to his general purpose; while the power of his logic and the depth of his intellect enabled him to unravel the sophistry and refute the unsound reasoning of his opponent. He proved that the power assumed by certain ecclesiastical officers

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 199, 200. † Ibid. p. 215, 221.

was antichristian and subversive of the purity and immunities of the church of Christ, whose highest interests were sacrificed to the wild ambition and worldly aims of a dominant priesthood. Throughout the dispute, Mr. Cartwright justly exposed existing abuses, advocated the necessity of a purer reformation, defended the principles of nonconformity, and refuted the cavils and objections of his opponent.

CHAPTER IV.

OBSERVATIONS ON THIS CONTROVERSY.

The account of this dispute, as furnished by many writers, is both distorted and untrue, and their severe censures have been conveyed from one writer to another down to the present time, degrading Mr. Cartwright as a man nearly destitute of learning, religion, and common sense. They have depreciated his Reply to to the very uttermost, and extolled the doctor's work as one of the most effective productions ever published! Their illiberal insinuation, extreme partiality, and daring misrepresentations are so numerous and so glaring that the intelligent reader would conclude they never read, and probably never saw, the documents in question. Though it is unnecessary to inquire by what motives these writers were governed, yet it could not be deemed improper to put the reader in possession of better information on the questions at issue, as derived from unexceptionable authority.

The reader will not be unprepared for one or two instances of severe censure. The learned historian often cited unequivocally affirms that Mr. Cartwright replied to Dr. Whitgift's book "with abundance of sharpness and a mixture of falsehood!"* The foregoing abstract will afford some amplification, if not a satisfactory refutation, of these grave imputations. Had the space allotted to this part of the controversy been extended, the triumph would have appeared far more decisive. It could not indeed be expected that, in a work of so large extent, there would be no exceptionable positions; especially at this early period when the regal supremacy of Christ and the birthright of conscience were so little understood; yet, as to the author having betrayed "abundance of sharpness," the book

* Strype's Parker, p. 419.

itself is a written testimony, and every reader a living witness of the injustice of the charge. From the numerous strictures on Mr. Cartwright's book, which came under examination prior to a perusal of the work, it was found to be severely censured as dealing in trifles, and betraying to a great extent a bitter and scurrilous spirit; but we are free to confess the surprise and gratification to find that the author, in refutation of these unworthy strictures, had abstained so much from the fashion of the age in which he lived. He possessed a nobler mind, more generous feelings, and a larger share of piety than to descend to the meanness of defending truth or of despoiling an adversary by defamation or other odious warfare. He left these unworthy implements to be employed by those who had no better weapons of defence. That he obtruded "falsehood" will certainly be questioned: but that he discovered great learning, profound judgment, sound argument, and a deep acquaintance with the holy Scriptures, will not be doubted; and it may be fairly presumed that he employed these high qualifications to some advantage in defence of the cause he espoused, as well as in refutation of those opinions which appeared to him opposed to the word of God.

Those who desire to become acquainted with the important subjects discussed could hardly read the work without cherishing deep interest and deriving signal advantage. The author is evidently master of his subject; and, as he proceeds, being conscious of the truth and importance of the cause he defends, his sole object is to promote the doctrine and kingdom of Jesus Christ. Whitgift's work is represented as not falling short of the Admonition in "rudeness and asperity."* And if it did not appear too much like retaliation, it might be justly observed, that, if Mr. Cartwright's book betrayed a degree of bitterness sevenfold, Whitgift's betrayed that which was seventy times seven; and, as to the force of reasoning contained in the two publications, the impartial reader, from what is already stated, will be able to judge. An author of great candour observes that Mr. Cartwright conducted this controversy with so much ability and justice that his very adversaries commended him for his publication.†

Mr. Cartwright is charged by a modern writer with having

* Hallam, vol. i. p. 213. † Clark, p. 18.

created troubles in the church by his writings and readings in the university; but forgetting to state the obvious fact of his most honourable and peaceable behaviour,* and that whatever troubles were created they were not created by him, but by the intolerant measures adopted to crush him and the improvements he recommended. His sentiments concerning archbishops have been submitted to the consideration of the reader. He was decidedly of opinion that their office, courts, and revenues, as well as their pomp and power, were opposed to the spirit and instructions of the gospel, and a direct subversion of the ecclesiastical offices appointed by Jesus Christ. With justice and truth he maintained that the archbishop's court of faculties, and the dispensations issued from it, were scandalous abuses transplanted from popery, contrary to the purity of Christ Jesus, and prejudicial to the diffusion of the gospel. He showed how unsuitable were the enormous revenues to men whose functions were spiritual; and that archbishops and lord-bishops, instead of employing their incomes to religious and charitable purposes, devoted them to pompous and luxurious living. It was therefore a fixed principle with him, as it was with the early Reformers, that they ought to be reduced to a more private condition, which would be no disgrace to the Church of England, but a signal blessing to the church of God, and far more agreeable to the office and character of the ministers of Jesus Christ.

From the discussion and exposure of glaring abuses, Archbishop Parker found it necessary to make an apology or defence to the Lord Treasurer Burghley. His grace vindicated the court of faculties, and cast the blame, if any blame existed, from himself on those from whom that court and its authority originated, ascribing, though a professed protestant, precisely the same authority to Queen Elizabeth as had heretofore been ascribed to the pope! The archbishop, in his continued narrative, proposed and answered the following question relating to Mr. Cartwright and his publication:—

"Why am I not redier to report the prudence and policy of Mr. Cartwright's book? These reasons move me. I am a principal party, and an offence to him. He is so well applauded that, however he dislikes the act of cutting throats or breaking men's

* Nares' Burghley, vol. iii. p. 255.

necks, he delights to apply both terms to archbishops and bishops. He saith that, besides our names, we have scarcely any thing common to those in ancient times; of whom he saith some had not a halfpenny to bless them with; and he thinks that, if our fat benefices were employed to the maintenance of poor ministers and the universities, the heat of this disputation and contention for archbishops and bishops would be well cooled. He is much offended with the train they keep, and saith that three parts of their servants are unprofitable to the church and commonwealth; and he is very angry with the furniture of their households. He thinks that no archbishop is needful in these times, except he were well assured that he would pronounce the truth of every question which shall arise; and when he is assured of this, it will make him more favourable to archbishops. The office of commissioner he saith is not permitted by God's word." His grace then adds: "Sir, because you are a principal counsellor, I refer the whole matter to her Majesty, and to your order, whether her Majesty and you will have any archbishops or bishops, or how you will have them ordered." *

The publication of Mr. Cartwright's book, with some others on the same subject, gave great offence to the queen, as well as to her bishops. Her Majesty's displeasure being enkindled, she issued her royal commands for suppressing these obnoxious publications. The zealous primate, not unwilling to aid the cause of intolerance, cheerfully seconded these compulsory measures, and endeavoured to rouse the energies of the lord treasurer and the rest of the privy council to promote the same unworthy objects. In addressing these honourable personages, he reminded them of their duty to her Majesty and the state, and of the indispensable necessity of mutual and zealous co-operation in this work. He betrayed too much the spirit of a fiery ecclesiastic, so common in those times, by casting degrading imputations on the character of the puritans, as if they were conspiring by some treasonable act to destroy both church and state!

"Seeing her highness," said he, "was justly offended with dissolute writing, and intended the reformation thereof, it was needful that those who were supreme judges, and who were long ago called

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xvii. art. 93.

upon, should earnestly labour in this service; otherwise he feared they should find *Munster's* commonwealth shortly attempted, and that must needs follow which Sleiden wrote in his History. If the laws of the land be rejected—if the queen's majesty's injunctions—if her chapel—if her authority be so neglected—if our Book of service be so abominable, and such paradoxes be applauded, God send us of his grace: I fear our wits are infatuated. God in due time answer our supplication!" *

Many weeks had not elapsed before the energies of the archbishop were zealously employed to promote the welfare of the church. Early in the month following, it is said, "some of those men who were labouring hard at the overthrow of the bishops," were apprehended and convened before the Star Chamber, where his grace attended as one of the supreme judges of the court, and declared what he conceived to be the evils coming by their means upon both church and state, and the great danger to the queen! On his return home he enforced what he had decided in the Star Chamber, by sending a letter immediately to the lord treasurer. The members of this court, it is said, were "pretty brisk" in their proceedings against the stigmatized puritans; but his grace, as guardian of the church, fearing their zeal would cool, as on former occasions, excited them to press forwards in suppressing these obnoxious Reformers. "I know them to be cowards," said he; "if you of the privy council give over, you will hinder her Majesty's government more than you are aware of, and much abate the estimation of your own authorities. I protest before God that it is not the fear I am in of displacing, but I wish for her Majesty's safety and estimation. In this I am careful, and right-willing; and therefore I am the more busy than paradventure some may think necessary: yet I shall pray to God that all things may prosperously succeed." †

It does not appear whether Mr. Cartwright was, on this occasion, among those who appeared before the tribunal of the Star Chamber; but Mr. Field and Mr. Wilcocks, being prisoners in Newgate for publishing the Admonition, most probably were of that number. The archbishop and his colleagues expressed deep regret to behold persons forsaking the church, slighting the Book of Common-prayer, treating the ecclesiastical government as antichristian, and

* Strype's Parker, p. 420. † Ibid. 421.

endeavouring to obtain another kind of church discipline. They concluded, like ruling ecclesiastics in every age, that these things tended to the ruin of religion and learning, and, by promoting the popularity of the state, the spoil of the patrimony of the church, and the confusion of the country, they would shake even the civil constitution!* But it may be asked, Why were not the proposed amendments made in the liturgy, by which conscientious persons might have been made easy, or even full liberty granted to all worthy subjects to worship God according to the instructions of his holy word? Was not the universal wreck so much dreaded the obvious fruit of intolerance, and not of the attempts to obtain a reformation of abuses?

Bishop Sandys, whose reform principles had exposed him to peril, turned about, retraced his steps, and became a determined opponent of that cause which he had zealously promoted! This course he adopted presently after his exaltation; and, in his first visitations, he proceeded with so much severity in depriving ministers of their benefices that his conduct excited warm expostulation even from Archbishop Parker.† He was soon after preferred to the bishopric of London, when he became a champion in the cause, and exerted his episcopal power in suppressing the Admonition and Mr. Cartwright's Reply, calling them "slanderous and infamous libels!" "If the Established Church," said he, "was allowed to be discredited and defaced, that bishops would labour in vain to promote its welfare." By the instigation of this prelate, and to prevent the diffusion of Mr. Cartwright's opinions and secure the utility of the Common-prayer, her Majesty issued the following proclamation:—

"The queen considering that notwithstanding, by great and mature deliberation of the wisest, a good and godly order of public prayer and administration of the sacraments have been set forth by the parliament, and commonly through the whole realm, in all the time of her Majesty's reign received and used; yet some persons, of *their own nature* unquietly disposed, desirous to change, and therefore ready to find fault with all well-established orders, have not only refrained from coming to the church, where the divine service and Common-prayer is orderly used, but also have used, of

* Strype's Parker, p. 422. † Middleton, vol. ii. p. 259.

their own devices, other rites and ceremonies than are by the laws of the land received and used: and, besides, that some of them have rashly set forth, and by stealth imprinted certain books, under the title of 'An Admonition to the Parliament,' and one other also in '*Defence* of the Admonition;' the which books do tend to no other end but to make divisions and dissensions in the opinions of men, and to breed talks and disputes against the common order. Her highness, therefore, both to repress such insolent and inordinate attempts of such as refuse to come to Common-prayer, and divine service, according to the order established by parliament, to the evil and pernicious example of others, and to keep her subjects in one uniform, godly, and quiet order within her realms, and to avoid all controversies, schisms, and dissensions that might arise, doth straitly charge and command all her faithful and true subjects to keep, and to cause others under them to keep, the order of Common-prayer, divine service, and administration of the sacraments, according as in the Book of divine service they are set forth, and none other contrary or repugnant, upon pain of her Majesty's highest indignation, and of other pains in the said Act comprised.

"And as concerning the said books, viz. 'The Admonition,' and all other books made for the *defence* of it, or agreeable therewith, the book chiefly tending to depraving and finding fault with the said Book of Common-prayer and administration of the sacraments, and of the order received here in this church and commonwealth of England, her Majesty strictly chargeth all and every printer, stationer, bookbinder, merchant, and all other men, of what quality or condition he or they may be, who have in their custody any of the said books, to bring in the same to the bishop of the diocess, or to one of her highness's privy council, within twenty days after he shall have notice of this proclamation, and not to suffer any of them, without license or allowance of the said bishop, upon pain of imprisonment and her highness's further displeasure. Given at our manor of Greenwich, the 11th of June 1573, in the 15th year of our reign." *

This is certainly an extraordinary document, breathing throughout the spirit of the age which gave it birth, the injustice and severity of which are too obvious to require comment. Her

* Strype's Parker, p. 421, 422.

Majesty, however, did not stop here, but openly declared "that she would *root out* puritanism and the favourers thereof!"* This was the spontaneous effusion of royal power. Bishop Grindal was therefore not quite correct when he affirmed "that tyranny, which had for many ages been exercised over the church, was altogether abolished;" and Bishop Cox, who accused the puritans of *schism*, was grieved to say that this evil increased "among men of a purer character," whose sermons "were of too popular a character against the popish filth and monstrous habits," as administering "impiety and damnation."† The liberty of the press was unknown in the days of Elizabeth; and, though one of the most valuable benefits to a civilized community, it was absolutely disallowed in this illustrious reign. Elizabeth professedly renounced the infallibility of Rome; but she needed that infallibility when she prescribed a religion for all her subjects, denouncing heavy penalties on every deviation from the royal standard! Her faithful and loyal subjects, on pain of "imprisonment" and her Majesty's "further displeasure," were not allowed to read, nor even to hold in their possession, the books published by the learned Cartwright, recommending the word of God as the only standard of reformation! These proceedings clearly show that her Majesty "meddled too much in matters above her comprehension."‡ Queen Elizabeth, said Bishop Jewel, was unwilling to be considered as the head of the church; and he added that she seriously maintained "that this honour was due to Christ alone, and could not belong to any human being whatsoever; besides which, these titles had been so foully contaminated by antichrist that they could not be adopted by any one without impiety!" § Did her Majesty in the above proceedings, then, forget what she had before maintained? The queen and her bishops directed their united efforts to crush religious inquiry, and to bring the nation under subjection to hierarchical despotism.

What then was the fruit of the royal proclamation? Did the "printers, stationers, bookbinders, merchants, and all others," deliver up the degraded publications, and tamely suffer themselves to be deprived of this portion of their property by the arbitrary

* Strype's Annals, vol. ii. p. 568. † Zurich Letters, p. 119, 221, 237.
‡ Chalmers' Biog. vol. xvi. p. 252. § Zurich Letters, p. 33.

pleasure of the royal lady? There were undoubtedly some thousands in the city of London,* yet, after the lapse of "twenty days," not a single copy was brought to the bishop! This galling disappointment clearly shows, on the one hand, the high esteem in which Mr. Cartwright's book was held by the people; and, on the other, the utter dislike they had to these suppressing measures.

Queen Elizabeth, according to Bishop Aylmer, came to the crown "like a lamb," and "like a mother" to nurse her subjects; and she "spoiled none!"† If this was her original character, it was presently changed and injured by exaltation. The royal assumption had no bounds. Without directing the reader to the insulting contempt with which she treated the two houses of parliament, of which there is ample proof on record, her Majesty, conducting the affairs of the church, was governed by mere sovereignty, which her servants, the bishops, highly applauded, except when directed against themselves. Elizabeth browbeat and suspended bishops, and silenced and deposed clergymen at pleasure. She upbraided Bishop Cox, and stigmatized him "proud prelate," assuring him that she who had made him bishop could "unmake him," and that unless he obeyed her instructions she would "unfrock him!"‡ She suspended Bishop Fletcher and Archbishop Grindal from their high functions; the former for marrying in advanced age, which, forsooth, her Majesty disapproved! the latter for refusing, contrary to his judgment and conscience, "to abridge the number of preachers and put down the religious exercises," which this sovereign lady imperiously demanded.§ Her Majesty had threatened Bishop Sandys with the deprivation of his bishopric, who, to escape this direful calamity, not only renounced his reforming principles, but likewise found it convenient to panegyrize her Majesty. This prelate, who prompted the queen to adopt the foregoing rash proceedings, openly declared that her Majesty was "the patroness of true religion, rightly termed 'The Defender of the Faith,' and sought above all things the kingdom of God." He added, "that her religious heart was accepted of the Lord, and

* Strype's Parker, p. 422. † Strype's Eccl. Mem. vol. iii. p. 483.

‡ Hallam, vol. i. p. 241.

§ Chalmers, vol. xiv. p. 393; Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxxviii. art. 13; Strype's Grindal, p. 221, 231, 238.

glorious in the eyes of the world;" and that she was "so zealous for God's house, and so firmly settled in the truth, that she had constantly determined and oftentimes vowed to suffer all torments rather than relent one jot in matters of religion!"* This time-serving prelate must have been extremely mortified at the failure of the late proclamation; and, in one of his letters to Burghley, he said "he had been desired to look into Mr. Cartwright's book, and see what good stuff was to be found there; but the truth was he could never obtain it, although it was current among many." † Why then did he condemn the book which he had never seen?

The month after her Majesty's proclamation was published, Bishop Grindal addressed a letter to Bullinger, informing him of the important occurrence and of the supposed improvements which the puritan Reformers sought to obtain. "They maintain," he said, "that archbishops and bishops ought to be reduced to the ranks; that the ministers of the church ought to be elected solely by the people; that they ought all to be placed on an equality; and that in every city, town or parish, a consistory should be established, consisting of the minister and elders of the place, who alone were to decide upon all ecclesiastical affairs; that the Church of England had scarcely the appearance of a Christian church; and that no set form of prayer ought to be prescribed, but that in the holy assemblies each minister should pray as the Holy Ghost might dictate." He added, "But a royal edict was lately published, in which *libels of this sort* are forbidden to be circulated, which circumstance, as I hope, will retard their endeavours."‡ Bishop Sandys, who was ever restless, sent an epistle to Lord Burghley, addressing him as follows:—

"I thought it my duty to address your lordship. That although the date of the late proclamation for bringing in the 'Admonition to the Parliament,' and other *seditious* books, is already expired, yet the whole city of London, where no doubt is great plenty, hath not brought one to my hands; and I can hardly think that their lordships of her Majesty's privy council have received many; whereby it may easily appear what boldness and disobedience these new writers have already wrought in the minds of the people, and that

* Strype's Annals, vol. i. p. 149. † Lansdowne MSS. vol. xvii. art. 30.
‡ Zurich Letters, p. 292.

against the civil magistrate, whom in words they seem to extol, but whose authority in very deed they labour to cast down! He seeth little who does not perceive that their whole proceedings tend to a mere popularity!"* The prelate addressed another epistle to Lord Burghley, dated September 5, 1572, enclosing a paper containing a number of recommendations to his lordship. The first consideration he recommended was "forthwith to cut off the Scottish queen's head!" This, our author observes, was probably the first direct proposition for the execution of Mary! Another recommendation was "that the gospel be earnestly promoted, and the church not burdened by unnecessary ceremonies!"† Why then was the bishop so active in silencing faithful preachers of the gospel for refusing to observe those ceremonies?

The prelates of those times unfortunately were unable to reconcile religious freedom and civil obedience, and could not comprehend the possibility of both existing in one commonwealth; so when any one wrote against the superstitious impositions of the church, or against severe persecution, he was branded as an enemy to the state! Their views were so manifestly erroneous that all who disapproved of the popery retained in the Established Church and expressed their dislike of existing intolerance, however loyal to her Majesty and obedient to the civil constitution, were stigmatized enemies to the civil magistrate, casting down his authority, and guilty of sedition or rebellion against the government. This very common error was the fruit of the unnatural incorporation of church and state. In every country where the laws of the church are not derived from the word of God, but from the same origin as those of the state, and the two constitutions are incorporated and made one, it is perfectly natural for its patrons to stigmatize all nonconformists to the church as enemies to the state! These delusions are unavoidably generated by a system fundamentally erroneous.

Notwithstanding the unwise attempts to degrade Mr. Cartwright and suppress his publication, both the author and his book were held in high estimation by persons of eminence. It is observed that many distinguished persons in London, as well as in the university of Cambridge, had the highest opinion of

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xvii. art. 37. † Wright's Elizabeth, vol. i. p. 430.

Mr. Cartwright and also of his publication. Many aldermen openly countenanced him, and he was secretly preserved in the city, where he had numerous admirers and visitors, "and wanted not for presents and gratuities." *

His publication, as might have been expected, was read with great avidity, especially by the opponents of persecution, and its contents made a powerful and lasting impression on their minds. From the open exposure of existing corruptions by the clear evidence of truth, many of his brethren gained fresh light and strength, declaring their opinions to the world, for which they became the victims of those in power. Among those who were sufferers in this cause was Mr. Edward Deering, lecturer at St. Paul's, London, a minister of distinguished eminence, who was arraigned before his ecclesiastical judges as before the papal Inquisition, when numerous interrogatories were proposed to him, said to have been collected from Mr. Cartwright's book, to which his answers were required.†

Mr. Deering was suspended, but afterwards restored to his lectureship, when the Bishop of London remained silent, for which the queen "bitterly rebuked" him.‡ The bishop, writing to Lord Burghley, strongly recommended the adoption of lenient measures, adding, "I think that a soft plaster is better than a sharp corrosive to be applied to this sore. If this man be somewhat spared, and yet well scolded, others being manifest offenders may be dealt with according to their deserts." He also added, "that it was only the malicious, proud bishops, who sought Mr. Deering's trouble!"§ The venerable prelate, however, presently repented of the exercise of moderation, and devoted his episcopal talents not only to silence Mr. Deering, but also to crush every deviation from the political standard of religion. His lordship not only adopted severe measures against scrupulous nonconformists, but also with fervent zeal excited the co-operation of his episcopal brethren. His "good resolutions," with those of the archbishop, may be seen in a letter which they jointly addressed to another bishop, who was absent from the High-commission, containing an account of their proceedings:—

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 53.
† Parte of Regis. p. 200—206.
‡ Strype's Parker, p. 427.
§ Lansdowne MSS. vol. xvii. art. 33, 35.

"These times are troublesome. The church is sorely assaulted, but not so much of open enemies, who can do less hurt, as of pretended favourers and false brethren, who, under the colour of reformation, seek the *ruin* and *subversion* both of *learning* and *religion!* Neither do they only cut down the ecclesiastical state, but also give a great push at the *civil* policy! Their colour is sincerity, under the countenance of simplicity; but in very truth they are ambitious spirits, and can abide no superiority. Their fancies are favoured by some of great calling, who seek to gain by other men's losses. And most plausible are these new devices to a great number of the people, who labour to live in all liberty. But the one blinded with the desire of getting, see not their own fall, which no doubt will follow; the other, hunting for alteration, pull upon their necks *intolerable* servitude. For these fanatical spirits, which labour to reign in men's consciences, will, if they may bring their purposes to pass, lay a heavy yoke upon their necks.

"In the platform set down by these new builders, we evidently see the spoilation of the patrimony of Christ, and a popular state to be sought: the end will be ruin to religion and confusion to our country. And that you may the better perceive how these fancies are embraced, and likely to take effect, except in time they be met withal, here enclosed we have sent you certain articles taken out of Cartwright's book by the council propounded to Mr. Deering, with his answers to the same; and also a copy of the council's letter writ to Mr. Deering to restore him to his former reading and preaching, his answer notwithstanding our advices never required thereunto!

"These proceedings puff them up with pride, make the people hate us, magnify them with great triumphing, that her Majesty and the privy council have good liking of this new building; which hitherto, as we think, in no Christian nation hath found any foundation upon the earth, but is now framed upon suppositions full of absurdities. We are persuaded that her Majesty hath no liking thereof, howsoever the matter be favoured by others.

"Forasmuch as God hath placed us to be governors in his church, hath committed unto us a care and charge thereof, and will one day require a reckoning at our hand for the same, it shall be our duties to labour by all means we can to see sound doctrine

maintained, gainsayers of the truth repressed, good order set down and observed, that the spouse of Christ, so dearly redeemed, may by our ministry be beautified. These perilous times require our painful travails; and, seeing that God's cause is brought into question, and the church many ways troubled, we must with good courage stand to the defence thereof, and resist the underminers. We here bear a heavy burden, and incur many dangers and displeasures; but nothing shall be grievous to us, if we may do good to His church.

"We doubt not but that you are like affected, and bear a burden in mind with us. We have made a special choice of you, whom for good learning, prudent counsel, and godly zeal we love and reverence, and have thought it good to put you in remembrance of these matters, and withal to require you to consider of these things and to be prepared for our next meeting, which we think will be shortly, to see unto the same, as may most tend to the glory of God, the good of His church, the maintainance of His gospel, the establishing of decent and good order, to the edifying of his people, and to the *repressing* of all gainsayers. Thus, thinking it convenient that you should keep these matters *secret to yourself,* we commend you to the good direction of God's Holy Spirit. From Lambeth, July 6, 1573. Your loving brethren."*

This document, styled a "notable letter," is certainly an extraordinary production, breathing the spirit of the age. The puritans are here denominated "pretended favourers and false brethren," who sought not only "the ruin and subversion both of learning and religion," but also to "cut down the ecclesiastical state, and give a push at the civil policy!" They are, moreover, stigmatized "ambitious and fanatical spirits," who could "abide no superiority," but laboured "to live in all liberty!" They are styled not only "new builders," but also "gainsayers" and "underminers," seeking "the spoilation of the patrimony of Christ and a popular state, the ruin of religion, and the confusion of our country!!" Any sober person would have supposed that the severe persecution of the puritans was sufficient to satisfy their enemies; but no, those who claimed the power to persecute employed their ability in aspersing and stigmatizing the persecuted. The imputations

* Strype's Parker, p. 433, 434.

heaped upon them are refuted by the most decisive historical records. No fact can be more obvious than that they contrived no plots, entered into no conspiracy, used no compulsory force; but they peaceably made known their opinions to the world, appealed to the judgments and consciences of the legislature, complained of existing abuses and oppressions, and prayed and petitioned, as their fathers had formerly done, for a purer reformation. Their numerous supplications presented to the right reverend prelates and others, though utterly unavailing, were sufficient to move any hearts possessed of sympathy or humanity. It will, therefore, be questioned whether they were deserving of the imputations heaped upon them. As the ecclesiastical establishment provided and prescribed a religion for all the people in the land, so the prelates, as the guardians of the church, could not endure any deviation from the standard which had been set up; and, when the puritans only claimed the liberty of publishing their religious sentiments and pious wishes, it will be further questioned whether they were deserving of the aspersions cast upon them in the foregoing letter. Archbishop Parker was so determined an enemy to those who scrupled conformity that his severity had scarcely any bounds; and it is recorded that "his zeal against the puritans betrayed him sometimes into great inconveniences: like a true *inquisitor*, he listened to every idle story of his scouts, and sent it presently to the queen or council; and the older he grew, the more did his jealousies prevail." Our churchman adds that it was in vain to expect toleration "from the queen's arbitrary spirit, the imperious humour of Parker, and the total disregard to the rights of conscience! The archbishop's intolerant temper taught men to question the authority that oppressed them."* He not only exercised authority with unsparing rigour, but even stretched his power so far beyond legal bounds that the queen herself, little as she was disposed to tolerate nonconformists or to resent the arbitrary conduct of her bishops, was moved at length to interpose and reverse his proceedings; and her Majesty even reproached him for want of submission to her royal pleasure!†

Bishop Sandys was anxious for the adoption of prompt and effective measures. To settle existing differences, and to promote

* Soames' Elizabeth, p. 201. † Strype's Parker, p. 491, 492.

universal conformity, he strongly recommended to the lord treasurer the formation of a new ecclesiastical tribunal. "I humbly pray your lordship," said he, "to be a means unto her Majesty that a *national council* may be called, wherein these matters now in question may be thoroughly debated and concluded, and by her Majesty confirmed, which may most tend to the true serving of God and to the good ordering of the Church of England. If your lordship travail herein, you shall travail in God's cause and for the quiet of his church, and the sooner the better. It is time to cut off these troublers. I have earnestly moved the Archbishop of Canterbury in this matter. We look for some orders from you touching these disordered men."* The recommendation however of the right reverend prelate proved an entire failure.

It has already appeared how distinguished a reputation Mr. Cartwright had obtained; neither his expulsion from the university nor the late proclamation diminished the high esteem in which he was held by those who knew him. His profound learning and abilities—his deep humility and exemplary piety—had made so powerful an impression on the minds of the collegians, and produced so many valuable benefits on the character and studies of the university, that his memory could not be easily obliterated. In that seat of learning, therefore, his book was received with affection, and perused with admiration, by all who revered his character and espoused the cause of freedom.

The popularity of the work was followed, however, by consequences not the most worthy of a protestant country. Whitgift and his book undoubtedly had their admirers, especially among the patrons of intolerance and those who had travelled half way from Canterbury to Rome; and it was no wonder if the friends of Mr. Cartwright were offended with the doctor and the production of his pen. Dr. Bying, the vice-chancellor of Cambridge, acquainted the chancellor with the state of the university, and lamented to behold those who ought to preach the truth of God and maintain unity sought occasion to oppugn the doctor's book; "yet," said he, "more with vehemence of words than soundness of reason." Whitgift, his book, and even the Book of Common-prayer, were alike spoken against.† The principles contained in Mr. Cart-

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xvii. art. 46.

† Strype's Whitgift, p. 42, 43.

wright's work prevailed to a considerable extent in St. John's College, and the master and scholars were accused of favouring those principles and of corrupting others. One of the public preachers, having professedly refuted Whitgift in the pulpit, was rebuked by one of the seniors; but the master, who was expected to censure him, justified what he had done. It is also observed that another member of the same college spoke against the authority of bishops, and that the master suffered another to take his degree in arts who was convicted of having spoken against both Whitgift's book and the Book of Common-prayer!* These were no ordinary offences to men whose religion was composed of two qualities—superstition and worldly emolument.

The reader before witnessed the suppression of the freedom of the press; he has now witnessed similar treatment of the freedom of speech. They are closely connected. If learned men might not publish from the press their opinions on religious subjects, and their reasons for ecclesiastical reform, they might not make them known in the public schools nor in the public congregations. In those days it was deemed an offence of no ordinary magnitude for scholars and divines to express their disbelief of Whitgift's doctrines, and their dislike of the abuses in the Book of the Common-prayer! Had the two publications been given by Divine inspiration, that surely would have been a doubtful reason for the punishment of those who could not believe their contents; but to punish learned men for making known the faults and corruptions of books confessedly the productions of man, while it betrayed the greatest degree of arrogance and degradation, it was an attempt to subvert the use of the human intellect, robbing men of the birthright of conscience, and depriving the Christian church of the benefit of free inquiry.

The doctor's book was considered by many as a feeble effort to uphold the church, and that it served not only to confirm the scruples and increase the number of nonconformists, but also to rekindle the zeal for a better Reformation. From the earliest period the clamorous cry was heard, "The church is in danger!" This ridiculous clamour may always be expected in proportion to the prevalence of abuses and the ardour for reform. The patrons

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 43.

of corruption, having but little concern for the welfare of souls, find that their craft is in danger, and raise the senseless outcry, which is usually extended also to the state! The reader, however, is aware that either the church or the state may be reformed without doing the least particle of mischief to the other. The church may be amended without injuring the state, and the state without injuring the church; but to reform either, both will assuredly be benefited.

As the publication of the doctor's work failed of producing conviction in the minds of the people, and of persuading them to a conformity to existing abuses, so Whitgift and his colleagues employed other and more effective weapons in this warfare. This was doubtless far more agreeable to their conceptions, and furnished them with arguments far more powerful than those employed by the doctor's pen, by which they had the fairest prospect of success both in defending the church and in crushing nonconformists. Dr. Whitgift and the heads of houses maintained a constant warfare in the university. Having the sanction of the queen and her bishops, the Star Chamber and High-commission, they were sure of triumph. Conducting this warfare by the use of pen and paper, the only proper weapons, proved an absolute failure; but possessing and employing the strong arm of power, as Whitgift's book warmly recommended, they could not fail of realizing absolute victory. Their argument was the same as that used by their forefathers in the dark ages—they *compelled* them to come in. Many learned divines felt this to their cost; and, since the doctor was the chief captain in conducting this warfare, it will not be deemed improper to furnish a specimen of his prowess in the university of Cambridge.

Mr. William Charke, a learned fellow of Peter-house, and one of the university preachers, was frequently convened before Dr. Whitgift and other heads of houses, and, refusing to recant what he had preached, he was expelled from the college and banished from the university.* Mr. Nicholas Brown, a learned fellow of Trinity College, and one of the university preachers, was also convened before Dr. Whitgift and others, and, after repeated examination, was cast into prison; but, refusing to belie his con-

† Strype's Whitgift, p. 44.

science by a public recantation, he was detained some time in prison, and after his release obliged to leave the place.* Dr. John Browning, senior fellow of Trinity College, was convened before Dr. Whitgift and other heads, and committed to prison for non-conformity. He was treated with great injustice and inhumanity; when he was not only deprived of his office and benefice, and kept in confinement, but prohibited the access of his servants and friends, it being the intention of his cruel persecutors to starve him to death!†

This is only a specimen of the measures recommended in Whitgift's book, and of the all-powerful arguments by which the heads of the university defended the church! As the doctor entertained high notions of ecclesiastical authority, so he and his colleagues brought them into vigorous operation. He had attempted to defend the church and to crush the Reformers by the use of pen and paper; but, having failed, he and his brethren came forwards by the use of heavier weapons, which were found far more effective. What the doctor could not do by all his learning and ingenuity, accompanied by a dominant and censorious spirit, he and his colleagues could, by other methods, accomplish with perfect ease. So long, however, as men fight with such weapons, it will be questioned whether their conduct be sustained by the maxims of Christianity or by the principles of justice and humanity.

Bishop Sandys had complained that the episcopal office was imposed upon him against his inclination;‡ yet he breathed the spirit of severe intolerance. This we learn from his notable letter, dated August 5, 1573, addressed to Lord Burghley and the Earl of Leicester, in which he complained bitterly of the preachers at Paul's Cross; that those who had formerly preached discreetly, he said, afterward fed the people's fancies, and bewitched them with fantastical flattery. Of this number was Dr. Richard Crick, chaplain to the Bishop of Norwich, highly commended for learning and sobriety, who preached on the subject of ecclesiastical policy, and endeavoured to confirm the statements in Mr. Cartwright's book as containing "the true platform of the apostolical church." As soon as his lordship heard of this "tragedy," having

* Baker's MSS. vol. iii. p. 395, 399; iv. 56.

† Lansdowne MSS. vol. xxx. art. 72, 73. ‡ Zurich Letters, p. 73.

the co-operation of Archbishop Parker, he sent a pursuivant to apprehend him: but the preacher had left the city; yet such measures were adopted that he doubted not he would soon be apprehended. His lordship brought similar charges against Mr. Arthur Wake, Canon of Christ's Church, Oxford, and a distinguished preacher. The day after he had preached at the Cross the bishop sent a pursuivant to apprehend him; but he had returned to Oxford, and, being a member of the university, he was beyond his lordship's jurisdiction. The bishop then pressed their lordship's favourable assistance and co-operation in crushing these puritan Reformers, a specimen of which will doubtless be acceptable to the reader.

"Such men," said he, "must be restrained if the state shall stand safe! Truly, my lords, I have dealt as carefully as I could to keep such fanatical spirits from the Cross; but the deceitful devil, enemy to religion, hath so poured out the poison of sedition, and so suddenly changed these wavering minds, that it is hard to tell whom a man may trust: but, by God's help, I will seize that heretic! The city will never be quiet until these authors of sedition, who are now esteemed as gods, as Field, Wilcocks, Cartwright, and others, be far removed from the city. The people resort to them as in popery they were wont to run on pilgrimage. If these idols, who are honoured for saints and greatly enriched with gifts, were removed from hence, their honour would fall into the dust; they would be taken for blocks as they are! A sharp letter from her Majesty would cut the courage of these men. Truly, my lords, it is high time to lay too your hands, if you mind the good of God's church with the safety of the state! I will do what I can, but I am too weak; our estimation is little—our authority is less: so that we are become contemptable in the eyes of the people! But, my lords, even for that reverence that you bear to the Almighty, for that love you bear to the church of Christ, and for the duty which you owe unto her Majesty and the safety of the state, as God hath placed you in authority and given you ability, so earnestly, prudently, and speedily resist these tumultuous enterprisers and these new-fangled fellows, and seek by all means you can the peace of the church with the tranquillity and safety of the realm!"*

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xvii. art. 43.

The reader may probably inquire, How far were the peace and safety of the country endangered by the puritan divines advocating the necessity of reforming abuses in the church? The venerable prelate represented the ministers of Christ as "idols," and the people as resorting to them, bestowing presents upon them, and holding them in high repute; but we have yet to learn that these were blemishes in their character or deserving of severe censure. But it ought to be further stated that Bishop Sandys did not always recommend severe coercion against the zealous and faithful ministers of Christ. In a letter, about a month after the one last mentioned, addressed to Lord Burghley, he said, "I lament to your lordship from the bottom of my heart, that such as should be *feeders* of the flock only feed themselves, and turn teaching into *commanding;* such I wish to be removed, and more faithful pastors placed in their rooms!"* Had this prelate conducted all his proceedings on the principles here expressed, not only would numerous faithful pastors have found less annoyance, but the name of Edwin Sandys have been transmitted with greater honour to posterity.

Queen Elizabeth's despotic rule, as already intimated, disallowed the liberty of the press; and her servants, the bishops, had the sovereign direction what books should, and what should not, be printed. It could hardly be supposed that the people would feel easy in this odious state of things; therefore, as their only redress, they issued publications from private presses, without prelatical sanction or control, which gave great offence to the right reverend fathers. Though Bishop Sandys had so signally failed in attempting to call in Mr. Cartwright's book, yet his lordship was successful in one department of his episcopal function. He was remarkably active in searching for obnoxious printers, and in punishing them according to his episcopal pleasure. He discovered a private printing-press, and apprehended the printers, whom he denominated a "confederacy;" the particulars of which he thus communicated to Lord Burghley:—

"I have caused to be found and taken in the country a printing-press, with the whole furniture; the printer, called Lacy, with certain others of that confederacy, are also apprehended. They have printed Cartwright's book again, in a fair print, to the num-

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xxx. art. 46.

ber of one thousand, as Lacy voluntarily confesses. How stubborn and malicious these men are, contrary to all authority, I leave to the report of Dr. Wilson, who can fully inform your lordship. What further is to be done in this matter, I expect your pleasure. I with authority must deal in this matter, or it will not be well done. The authors of these troubles are here in great jollity, having great access to them, boasting themselves, and spitefully railing against others."*

The venerable prelate was of opinion that the punishment of confederated printers could not be "well done," unless he was the doer of it; but, surely, it would not have been less honourable to the character of a Christian bishop, if, instead of prosecuting and punishing printers, he had been assiduously employed in promoting the spiritual welfare of his diocese, or even of one congregation. His lordship, having his spies continually on the watch, could scarcely fail of eventual success; and, though his patience was at first somewhat tried by the people refusing to bring in the stigmatized publication, yet his assiduity and perseverance at length found some remuneration. In catching printers and seizing printing-presses, his lordship had the satisfaction to find that his labours were not in vain; and, by these zealous episcopal efforts, several printers were arraigned before the High-commission.

Mr. John Stroud, formerly a minister at Yalding in Kent, was among the first-fruits of his episcopal care and watchfulness. He was a person of good learning, exemplary piety, peaceable behaviour, and a faithful and useful preacher, but severely treated by the bishops, the particulars of which are already before the public. Being excommunicated, deprived of his ministry, and reduced to poverty, he was necessitated to engage in the office of correcting the press, and of publishing books to obtain a livelihood. But in this occupation he was not suffered to live in peace. Having published Mr. Cartwright's reply to Whitgift, he was convened before the Bishop of London and his colleagues in the High-commission, when he underwent a close examination.

Mr. Stroud, being asked what became of the stigmatized publications, said that he delivered thirty-four copies to his lordship

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xvii. art. 45.

of London, but that the rest were dispersed abroad. And, when he was asked how he dare print them a second time, seeing her Majesty's proclamation was against him, he said they were printed before her proclamation came out, or he would not have printed them. On which the bishop inquired, "Are Mr. Cartwright's books good and lawful or not? and will you defend them?" Mr. Stroud replied, "As there is no book without faults, the book of God excepted, so will I not affirm that this book is altogether without faults; but to defend it, I will not. He is of age to defend himself. And, as for the book, I think your lordship will not utterly condemn it." To this the bishop answered, "I confess there is something in it godly. It is a very evil book that hath no good thing in it. But, I say, the book is *wicked*, and is the cause of error and dissention in the church!" Mr. Stroud was then asked whether he condemned the Book of Common-prayer, whether it was antichristian, and many other equally silly and impertinent questions; to each of which he answered with great prudence and moderation. The bishop said, "Thou wilt then agree to these three things: That thou hast offended against the law in printing Cartwright's book; that Cartwright's book is neither godly nor lawful; that thou dost not condemn the Book of Common-prayer, but wilt receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the order prescribed." To this Mr. Stroud meekly replied, "I say, as I have said before, if I had condemned the Book of Common-prayer, I would not have resorted to the church as I have done."*

The reader has been reminded that Bishop Sandys, on sober reflection, saw cause for changing his opinion and repenting of severe measures. This he expressed in the following communication addressed to the Lord Treasurer Burghley:—

"I humbly pray your lordship to give ear and credit to the bringer hereof, a man of good integrity, and unsuspected of the clamourous world to be sent from me. All my doings are so searched out, sifted, and misconstrued that I thought it not convenient to send one of my own family, but chose this my trusty friend. What I crave of your lordship he will declare to you. My suit seemeth to be so reasonable that I trust your lordship will

* MS. Register, p. 194, 195.

easily grant it; for I only seek that my ministry may be profitable to the church of Christ. I would continue no longer than I may do good. If you think my service necessary, then I trust that you will be a means to preserve my credit with the people, which is already too much injured, not by my desert, but through the slanderous speeches of the evil-minded.

"I renew but my old and often suit, as well to her Majesty as to your lordship and others. The matter is merely temporal, and fitted for temporal men to deal in. It is not convenient that men of my calling deal with matters of *conscience*, and to send men to the *Tower* and *torture;* for, as your lordship well remembered in your last letter to me, we should rather be *feeders* than *punishers*. If the printer of that seditious book is most justly to be corrected—if the aiders and maintainers of him are to be punished, verily the defenders of the errors contained therein are not worthy to find favour; but I will stay my pen, and humbly pray your lordship to hear the messenger. Thus commending my cause to your honourable consideration, and your lordship to the good direction of God's Holy Spirit, I humbly take my leave. From my house at Fulham, this September 19, 1573. Your lordship's at command."*

The prelate's epistle very properly recommends one of the first and most important principles of protestanism; that it was not convenient for bishops to "deal in matters of conscience" by sending men "to the Tower and torture," but that they ought to be "feeders," not "punishers," of the flock of Christ. Had this sacred principle been thoroughly appreciated and fully carried out incalculable mischief would have been prevented, the honour of episcopacy secured, the prosperity of religion promoted, the glory of God advanced, and the kingdom of Christ increased. Though Bishop Sandys so highly commended Christian leniency as demanding universal observance, and as forcibly required by Jesus Christ, yet there have been few bishops calling themselves protestants whose proceedings were more remote from moderation, or more characterized by severity; so that he had some reason to expect "the clamours of the world." Men thus employed might naturally suppose, as his lordship intimated, that their doings would be

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xvii. art. 47.

"searched" and "sifted;" and it could be no wonder if, in some instances, they were "misconstrued;" but there was one and only one method of silencing these clamours and of establishing his "credit," which was to have relinquished these disreputable practices. The prelate does not say what punishment ought to have been inflicted on the printers of Mr. Cartwright's book; but, if they deserved heavy chastisement, he reasoned wisely when he concluded that the author was not "worthy of favour."

In the proceedings against rebellious printers, Archbishop Parker was not an unconcerned spectator, but a principal actor, in promoting these important services of the church. Nor were his labours in vain. His grace informed the treasurer that Harrison, the warden of the printers, brought him one other book in quires, and told him that one Asplyn, a printer of Cartwright's book, had undergone an examination, but was suffered to go abroad.* Mr. Thomas Woodcock, one of the stationers' company, a man of reputable character, met with less favourable treatment; and, for selling the Admonition, he was committed to Newgate by the Bishop of London, who "was more severe with the puritans than with the papists."† The fact was attested by his practice. This prelate, it may be presumed, could scarcely forget all the occurrences of the late reign, especially his "vile lodgings" in the Tower and the Marshalsea, with his escape and flight to a foreign land. But being now made a lord-bishop, and invested with power, constituted all the difference! One author unhesitatingly affirms that he manifested "as much piety, *meekness*, and benevolence as ever ornamented the clerical character;" yet another attests, from the clearest facts, that he "must have been lamentably defective in Christian *meekness* and forbearance."‡

Dr. Cox, Bishop of Ely, came forward as the champion of the church. This venerable prelate had been, prior to his advancement, the zealous advocate of a thorough reformation; and, though he was made a bishop, he could scarcely have forgotten that he had been cast into prison for his heretical principles, both in the reign of King Henry and Queen Mary. But, having renounced the

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xvii. art. 56.

† Ibid. vol. xxvii. art. 37; Chalmers, vol. iii. p. 208.

‡ Lodge's Illus. vol. ii. p. 222; Chalmers, vol. xxvii. p. 130, 136.

cause of reform, and abandoned his honourable avowals, he not only betrayed his schismatical conduct against the English exiles and original settlers at Frankfort,* but, having been made a bishop, he vigorously opposed all attempts to promote reform. He accordingly addressed a letter to Archbishop Parker, strongly recommending him to persevere in reclaiming or punishing the puritan Reformers, and not to be dishcartened with the frowns of those court-favourites who protected them, assuring him that he might expect the blessing of God on his efforts to free the church from these men and to establish universal uniformity! His brother Aylmer had published to the world that even the prince on the throne could not ordain any thing without consent of the parliament, and that those who denied King Henry's proclamations to have the force of law "were good fathers of their country, and worthy of commendation for defending their liberty."† But, when the privy council interposed to screen puritan divines from episcopal persecution, the hardy prelate Cox wrote a bold letter to Lord Burghley, warmly expostulating with the council for meddling in such affairs, which, he said, belonged exclusively to the bishops. He, moreover, admonished the council to keep within their own legitimate province, threatening to appeal to her Majesty, if they continued to interfere in matters which did not belong to them!‡ This was assuming a lofty tone.

While this prelate styled Whitgift "the most vehement enemy of the schismatics, and the chief instrument against them," he said he was not aware that the bishops dealt harshly with their puritan brethren, but tempered "what was severe with surprising lenity;" they were, nevertheless, "lying in concealment," and "terrified by the authority of the queen."§ He stigmatized them schismatics and hypocrites: yet, "by their plausible doctrine, they easily allured the nobility into their net;" and they subverted "those who were gaping, like hungry wolves and ravens, after the revenues of cathedral churches." He added that they aimed to bring the bishops "to the condition of the primitive church, and the poverty of the apostles."‖ But it is recorded of Bishop Cox

* Biog. Brit. vol. iii. p. 38; Troubles at Frankfort, p. 36—42. † Martin's Epitome, p. 40.
‡ Lansdowne MSS. vol. xvii. art. 42; Chalmers, vol. x. p. 432.
§ Zurich Letters, p. 297, 299, 309. ‖ Ibid. p. 317, 319.

that his character "would have shone more purely had he known how to conduct himself with a better temper," and that he was held in little esteem by the queen; yet our author leaves it doubtful whether this arose from his retiredness, or his want of hospitality, or his spoilation of the woods and parks, "feeding his family with powdered venison!" *

Bishop Horn was remarkably severe in his reflections on the puritan Reformers, stigmatizing them "contentious, vain-glorious, mischievous, and men of ungovernable discord." He also censured them for "retarding the progress of the gospel," even when the bishops had *silenced* them; and when silenced, he said, "they skulked about and became of no importance!" † And Bishop Sandys was so deeply engaged in persecution that he complained of being "overwhelmed with business:" yet he said the church was in such a "wretched state," that it demanded "all his exertions;" and it would be difficult to imagine "with what approbation this *new face* of things was regarded, as well by the people as the nobility." He then added, "These good men are crying out that they have all the reformed churches on their side." ‡

The puritans were indeed great sufferers. The facts are placed on faithful record that, when they with "godly grief" bewailed the imperfections remaining in the church, and craved a redress of abuses, or were accused "by the malice of atheists, papists or epicures," they were convened before the bishops, and were not only reviled and stigmatized "precisious, contentious, seditious, rebellious, and traitors," but also, if they refused to subscribe whatsoever was required of them, they were deprived and cast into prison without the prospect of deliverance.§

When they were deprived of the liberty of preaching the gospel, and of publishing their theological opinions from the press, they sought to obtain a public conference with their adversaries. This privilege had been allowed to protestants in the reign of Queen Mary, and to catholics at the accession of Elizabeth; but, on this occasion, a shorter method was adopted, and the disputants were summoned before the tribunal of the High-commission. Mr. Cartwright's enemies, who dreaded the power of his

* Nares' Burghley, vol. iii. p. 168; Wood, vol. i. p. 162. † Zurich Letters, p. 320.
‡ Ibid. p. 295, 296. § Troubles at Frankfort, p. 167.

principles, could not be easy for him and his opponent to exhibit their written arguments; but, being dissatisfied with his enjoyment of liberty, they employed more formidable methods of achieving the victory. It was insufficient, in their estimation, to deprive him of academical emoluments, to banish him from the university, and to prohibit the circulation of his writings; but the queen being "very angry" at him, "wished to have him brought to trial to answer for his dealings and demeanors."* The following warrant was therefore issued for his apprehension, signed by Bishop Sandys and eleven others of the High-commission:—

"To all mayors, sheriffs, bailiffs, constables, headboroughs, and to all other of the queen's Majesty's officers unto whom this may come or appertain; to every one of them, as well within the liberties as without. We do require you, and therewith straitly command you, and every one of you, in the queen's Majesty's name, that you be aiding and assisting to the bearer and bearers hereof, with all the best means that you can devise, for the apprehension of one *Thomas Cartwright*, student in divinity, wheresoever he be, within the liberties or without, within the realm. And you having possession of his body by your good travail and diligence in this behalf, we do likewise charge you (for so is her Majesty's pleasure) that he be brought up by you to London, with a sufficient number for his safe appearance before us, and other her Majesty's commissioners of *Oyer* and *Terminer* in causes ecclesiastical, for his *unlawful dealings* and *demeanors* in matters touching religion and the state of this realm. And this fail you not to do, every one of you, with all diligence, as you will answer to the contrary to your utmost perils. From London, this 11th day of December, 1573."†

Concerning this extraordinary document, it will be necessary, for the sake of elucidation, to make a few inquiries. What crime had Mr. Cartwright committed to make the queen so "angry" and so wishful for his trial? The answer is here published to the world: that he was guilty of "unlawful dealings and demeanors in matters of religion and the state of the realm!" And what were his dealings and demeanors? "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon," that the offences by which her Majesty's

* Strype, vol. ii. p. 282. † Ibid.

displeasure was awakened, and for which the High-commission proceeded against him, were no less than that of claiming the right of believing the testimony of Scripture, and of publishing his religious opinions to the world; the most offensive of which have been already stated!

The reader may inquire, Why were these proceedings extended to "the state" as well as to "matters touching religion?" This undoubtedly referred to the *civil* state; but Mr. Cartwright had sufficiently acquitted himself in the book which gave so much offence; yet the queen and her sage commissioners, in reading the book, if they ever did read it, could not see this, though very prominently and decisively stated. They could not conceive it possible for men to claim the right of private judgment in religion, and remain loyal and obedient subjects! From the influence of custom, or the force of education, for the sake of worldly interest, or to preserve their outward grandeur, or to make the church and the state prop each other up, these venerable politicians concluded that to expose the corruptions of the church, and recommend the reformation of abuses, amounted to conspiracy against the state! What could be more palpably foolish, or betray more manifest injustice than these proceedings? Why were these honourable personages denominated commissioners in "causes ecclesiastical?" If civil and ecclesiastical causes were perfectly distinct, why did these ecclesiastical gentlemen extend their power and authority to matters pertaining to the *civil* constitution?

Mr. Cartwright, it will be seen, was placed in very peculiar circumstances; and his case was powerfully, yet painfully, interesting to every pious mind. He was not permitted to live in peace in any corner of his native land, but was treated as an outcast and disgrace to society. The worst offence he had committed was that he refused to believe doctrines contrary to the evidence of his senses, and ventured to believe those which appeared to be according to the word of God! He refused to barter his conscience and his principles for human favour and worldly gain, and preferred living in a land of exile rather than under spiritual vassalage in his native country. The document issued against him, while breathing the spirit of persecution, will probably be considered an insult to a protestant country. If the publication

of his opinions was deemed an offence to protestants, was not the publication of their opinions a similar offence in the time of popery? But, if it was praiseworthy in protestants publishing their opinions in popish times, was it not equally praiseworthy in Mr. Cartwright publishing his religious sentiments for the careful examination of protestants?

In addition to Bishop Sandys, whose name stands at the head of this extraordinary document, were the names of Dr. Alexander Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's, Dr. Gabriel Goodman, Dean of Westminster, and other names familiar to the historians of those times. How much soever this order might then be admired and applauded, it will now be questioned whether the united exertions of these reverend gentlemen reflect any great degree of credit on their understandings or their hearts. The bishop, however, pressed forwards in silencing and imprisoning the ministers of Christ. He silenced Mr. Robert Johnson, minister of St. Clement's Church, London, and committed him a close prisoner in the Gatehouse, where he fell sick, and his life was in danger from the severity of his confinement. Mr. Johnson, under this heavy affliction, addressed a heart-stirring letter to Bishop Sandys, styling him "superintendent of popish corruptions in the diocess of London." The privy council, deeply moved with sympathy, addressed two letters to the bishop, signifying that Mr. Johnson, committed to the Gatehouse for nonconformity, was very sick, and likely to die unless he might enjoy the benefit of open air; they therefore even *commanded* his lordship to give instructions for the afflicted prisoner to be bailed, and, on obtaining sureties, to be removed to his own house, but not to depart thence without further order.* These efforts were disregarded. The prelate remained inflexible. Mr. Johnson found neither lenity, nor charity, nor any other relief; but he remained in the Gatehouse, where he languished and died through the severity of the prison!† This hardy, oppressive prelate, when made Archbishop of York, complained that he and his colleagues were unable to banish "these new men," as he styled the puritans, altogether out of the church;‡ we find, however, that he was able to banish some of

* Baker's MSS. vol. xxi. p. 383, 384. † Parte of Regis. p. 111, 118.
‡ Zurich Letters, p. 332.

them out of the world! He is, nevertheless, represented as a favourer of puritanical principles, and as leaning towards the puritans!* He was no friend to frequent preaching, fasting, and prayer; and, addressing official instructions to Bishop Chadderton, of Chester, he said, "My lord, you are noted to yield too much in general fasting, and all-the-day preaching and praying," which "the wisest and best learned cannot like, neither will her Majesty permit it! There lurketh matter under that pretended piety. The devil is crafty; and the young ministers of our times are grown mad!" †

Will it be admitted that all men have an indubitable right to embrace and to promulgate the religion of Jesus Christ? It will then be deemed a subversion of that right to treat men as Mr. Cartwright was treated; and such proceedings will scarcely be deemed praiseworthy, even by the admirers of the renowned Elizabeth and her bishops. But it will be necessary also to inquire, What were the beneficial results of the foregoing ecclesiastical order? The inquisitive reader will be anxious to learn how far these renewed efforts were successful, and wish to know whether the stigmatized author was apprehended and punished. He had retired from public notice, and could not be found. He resolved to seek refuge beyond the reach of his enemies. From the unkind treatment he had already received, and the hardships endured by many of his brethren, then groaning in Newgate and other prisons, he was aware that, if apprehended, he had no reason to expect less cruel treatment.

It must be acknowledged that Mr. Cartwright, in defending ecclesiastical reform, made a bold stand, and laid a sure foundation, appealing on all subjects to the oracles of God; and though a mighty tempest arose, yet he survived the storm and escaped the power of his enemies. His instructions touched existing abuses, and called for reformation; for which his faith and patience were long and severely tried. He felt the power of intolerance, and was forced to drink the bitter cup. He appreciated the power of religious principle, and learned the invaluable lesson, "To obey God rather than men." When those in exalted stations attempt to counteract this principle, they not only over-

* Soames' Elizabeth, p. 365. † Peck's Decid. vol. i. p. 102.

step their legitimate boundary, but also assume an authority which does not, which cannot, belong to them, and their conduct requires unqualified condemnation.

The power of religious principle was at this period very little known, especially among the higher order of ecclesiastics, whose minds were too much absorbed with places and pensions, sinecures and endowments, to appreciate a subject so uncongenial to their taste. Their common, but childish, refuge was that every thing in the church was already settled; so they seemed to shut their eyes against all further improvement. Their examination of abuses was crippled and interrupted by ponderous obstructions, arising from antiquity, educational impression, legal enactment, and the public purse, which jointly constituted an authority that few persons were inclined to dispute; but ancient errors found shelter in dignified patronage, episcopal sanction, and rich endowments. The highest civil power coincided with the ecclesiastical dignataries which she had created; so there was no flattering prospect of reform.

The question may be asked, Was it possible to betray so feeble an intellect, or so deficient sober reflection, as to affirm that public functionaries were authorized to claim and exercise the power of governing the people's intercourse with God? According to the New Testament, the maintenance and government of Christian churches was not committed to the rulers of the world, and that, in matters of faith and worship, Christians owe no allegiance to men in power; but, when earthly rulers inflict punishment on men for their religious principles, they are guilty of usurping His prerogative to whom *alone* rational men are responsible in such matters. The principle advocated cannot be charged with encroaching on the prerogative of earthly rulers, but will teach them not to encroach on the prerogative of Jesus Christ and his holy administration, by which princes will secure the cordial allegiance of all worthy subjects. If those in power claim religious obedience of the people, do they not rob the King of his regalia and invest themselves with the spoils? do they not impeach His wisdom in appointing inefficient means of propagating Christianity? Are those means then so defective and inappropriate as to require the amendments of men? Do mortals assume in these matters

both the prerogative and ability of correcting their Maker? These inquiries demand the most solemn and unbiassed consideration. Mr. Cartwright, to elude danger, was actuated by the principle of self-preservation to seek refuge from the storm.

At this period we find that Mr. Cartwright's brother was convened before Archbishop Parker, whom his grace denominated "a vain young stripling," whose mind was in a state of "phrensey;" and he committed him to the Gatehouse, as the fittest expedient, "till his wits returned." The primate said "that his wit was so foolish and so simple that he thought this to be a good way, because his brother and such precisians should not think that he dealt hardly with the young man for his brother's sake!" Mr. Cartwright's opinions, said the primate, had so troubled the state of the realm that he found it necessary to employ the clergy "to beat them out of the heads of the people," as if physical force was the proper instrumentality of enlightening their minds and convincing their judgments.*

The reader has been already reminded of Mr. Cartwright's reputation in the city of London, where he was exceedingly revered by many aldermen and wealthy citizens. The learned historian who furnishes this information affirms, in one place, that "he was secretly harboured in the city;" yet, in another, that "he skulked privately in the city, and great was the application to him."† How discourteous was this! Mr. Cartwright had endured extreme hardship at Cambridge; his book was suppressed by proclamation; his name reproached; his character vilified; his person harassed and persecuted; and, to finish the business, he is branded with skulking privately in the city, because, forsooth, he sought to escape falling into the hands of those whose tender mercy was cruelty! for which every generous man will applaud his conduct. The reader will clearly perceive how easy it is for men in power to crush an adversary, and destroy, or attempt to destroy, his reputation, without refuting his opinions. On the one hand, royal proclamations and orders from ecclesiastical courts, with the clamours of the world, cannot prove that truth is on their side, nor disprove the statements of an opponent; so, on the other, to fight with such weapons exposes the folly and weakness of the disputant,

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xix. art. 60. † Strype's Whitgift, p. 53; Parker, p. 428.

betrays the unworthiness of his cause, and excites strong suspicion that truth and righteousness belong exclusively to the contrary party.

The most vigorous search was made for Mr. Cartwright, and information was sent to those in power. The venerable Archbishop Grindal did not withhold his hand from these unworthy efforts, but wrote to his brother of Canterbury, furnishing information that Mr. Cartwright lodged at the house of Mr. Martin in Cheapside, a person concerned in the mint, and afterward lord mayor; but this communication, it seems, arrived too late.*

Mr. Cartwright held a friendly correspondence with many persons of distinction, from whom he received great encouragement, with pecuniary presents; and they did not withhold their sympathy and affection in this season of extremity. He was revered and beloved by the enemies of persecution who defended the truth of Jesus Christ. Among those from whom he received seasonable relief was Mr. Michael Hicks, the distinguished secretary of Lord Burghley; and, having received a handsome present of money from this honourable friend, he politely returned part to the donor, expressing the warmest thanks for this act of kindness. This he did only two days before the order was issued for apprehending him, as appears from the following letter to his benevolent patron:—

"It was very reasonable, that upon the old acquaintance that I had, and no duty that is past or to come, that I should not only be chargeable with whilst I was there, but also, when I went, should carry away money with me; for which money such lodging, I might show, grow to the rights of an English bishop. But because you were so earnest with me, and because you should please yourself, I was not unwilling to be forth bound to you, I received it. Now give me leave also, I beseech you, good Mr. Hicks, to return some part of it to you in a book, wherein are laid up great riches and treasures which last for ever. The doctrine whereof hath in her right hand life, and in her left hand honour: and all good things meet for all ages, but especially for youth; for all estates and orders of men, but singularly for those whom God hath blessed with some better estate than the rest.

* Strype's Parker, p. 413.

"I beseech you, therefore, receive it at my hand, having notwithstanding, I assure you, reserved a good portion of it to myself, which I will keep as you wish me as a token to put me in remembrance of you, lest in any thing I should be very forgetful, if I should have forgotten your kindness as if it had not been. And thus with my humble thanks to you, I commend you to the tuition of our God, whom I beseech to increase with all manner of his gracious blessings, and especially with that sweet knowledge of his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, to your full comfort and joy, that can never be taken from you. December 9, 1573. Yours to command."*

From this epistle it appears that Mr. Cartwright was cheerful and happy in this gloomy season. His amiable piety, and a conviction of suffering for righteousness' sake, inspired him with strong confidence in the Lord, enriched his soul with consolatory reflections, and enabled him to rejoice in painful tribulation. Having prudently retired from these oppressive scenes, and forsaken the shores of his native country, he sought and found an asylum in a foreign land. His departure was not long after the order was issued from the High-commission, as appears from a letter of Mr. Wilcocks addressed to the venerable Mr. Gilby, dated the second of February, in which he observes, "Our brother Cartwright is escaped, God be praised, and departed this land, since my coming up to London, and, I hope, is by this time in Heidelberg. The Lord bless him, and direct him in all things by his Holy Spirit, that he may do that which will serve for the advancement of his glory and the profit of his church. His earnest desire is that you and all the godly should remember him in your earnest and hearty prayers; therefore I the more boldly and willingly make mention of him."†

Mr. Cartwright, like numerous protestants in the reign of Queen Mary, forsook the land of his fathers, but not till the defence of reform rendered that step necessary to his personal safety. Thus, in addition to other trials, he was not allowed to enjoy quietude in any part of England, but was forced by the arm of power to seek refuge and procure his bread in a foreign land. Dr. Whitgift not only escaped these calamities, but was soon after preferred to the

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xviii. art. 18. † Baker's MSS. vol. xxxii. p. 440.

bishopric of Worcester. Here the reader beholds another imporant conquest; but whether the treatment of Mr. Cartwright reflected honour on the victor was certainly doubtful, if not disgraceful to a protestant country. These proceedings exhibited the erroneous and dangerous principles of men in power, who devised and established a system of expediency; and, instead of adjusting all things in obedience to inspired truth, they were stimulated and guided by state policy, in fearful departure from the records of the New Testament. So the founders and defenders of the Established Church, under the resistless bias of political power, practically *dissented* from apostolical authority.

It was a mournful fact that learned divines were not allowed to publish their religious sentiments without exposing themselves to royal indignation and the terrors of the High-commission! This clearly shows that darkness veiled the minds of those in power, who had, therefore, much to unlearn, as well as to learn, before they could appreciate the gospel of Christ and their responsibility to God. But a better state of things now exists. Every man now enjoys the right of publishing his religious opinions; but, if he announce to the world sentiments contrary to inspired truth, they are open to refutation, not by the sword of the magistrate, but by "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." The worst of former severities are passed away; and all who deserve the name of protestants recognise the exclusive authority of the holy Scriptures, being assured that the various peculiarities of faith and worship are contained in the oracles of God. They are also aware of the danger of employing power, or expediency, or the opinions of men to counteract the free operation of sacred truth, and that the revealed will of God *alone* constitutes the great law of Christian doctrine and worship, from which there is no honourable or legitimate appeal.

CHAPTER V.

WHITGIFT'S DEFENCE AND CARTWRIGHT'S SECOND REPLY.

The uncatholic measures adopted in vanquishing Mr. Cartwright, and the discourteous method of conducting theological controversy, have been fully stated. The reader has beheld, probably with some degree of regret, the scheme recommended by Dr. Whitgift, and carried out by the High-commission, of blunting the pen as well as of stopping the mouth of an opponent. It ought in justice to be observed that, while the doctor showed his fiery zeal in this cause and brandished the sword in its defence, he undertook the service of the church in a way not less honourable to his character, and employed weapons not less worthy of a man professing godliness. He again directed his ecclesiastical prowess from the press; and the Reply to his Answer was no sooner published than he ventured to defend his former positions, and to attempt the refutation of his opponent.

Soon after the publication of Mr. Cartwright's Reply, a small volume was published containing one hundred and ninety-four pages, entitled, "A Defence of the Ecclesiastical Regiment in Englande, defaced by T. C. in his Replie against D. Whitgift," duo. 1574. Though printed by Whitgift's printer, the work was anonymous; and no evidence has transpired, either that he was, or was not, the author. It was probably intended as an introduction to a more elaborate answer, and treats of ecclesiastical officers, their livings, their courts, their dispensations, their civil offices, the ceremonies of the church, and the observance of holidays.

It was deemed incumbent on Dr. Whitgift to vindicate himself and his cause; so he set himself vigorously to compile a Defence

of his Answer. Archbishop Parker insinuated that Mr. Cartwright had treated his opponent with "rude and scurrilous" language; and, lest Whitgift should be fearful of pursuing the contest, his grace exhorted him not to be discouraged with difficulties, but to press forwards in a work which so much concerned the welfare of the church. He recommended him to use all possible brevity, and to hasten his Defence, "because the vulgar so much applaud and cry up Cartwright's Reply."*

Dr. Whitgift having, as heretofore, so distinguished a patron, was remarkably cheerful and happy in pursuing the work he had undertaken, of which he informed the archbishop by letter, dated June 4, 1573, and, having humbly thanked him for his good counsel, he said, "I thank God, I am as quiet in mind, as cheerful in soul, as much delighted in study, and as willing to take any pains in these matters as ever I was, though the unchristian tongues of this schismatical faction brute abroad the contrary. I do not mind to set down any other book but my own (without the Admonition), his Reply, and my Answer to the same; which I must of necessity do, both to detect his fraudulent dealing, to open his manifest untruths, and to avoid cavelling. The book will be something large, but I hope not tedious to any that shall be desirous to see the debth of this controversy."†

The archbishop, having received this epistle, sent it to the lord treasurer, recommending the cause to his patronage and encouragement, when his grace showed the warmth of his affection and the fervency of his zeal in favour of the Established Church, declaring that, on his return from the Star Chamber, the enclosed letter had been put into his hands, and he trusted that his lordship would inquire and ascertain whether the bishops were cowards. If his lordship afforded assistance in this cause, "he would serve her Majesty's government more than he did in war!"‡ It was therefore considered high time, says a learned churchman, "to unravel Cartwright's thin-spun book, and to expose all the weakness of it." This was the undertaking of Dr. Whitgift, who, in preparing his work for the press, submitted his papers to the careful revision of the archbishop, and of other bishops and learned men.§ The author

* Strype's Parker, p. 420.

† Lansdowne MSS. vol. xvii. art. 34.

‡ Ibid.

§ Strype's Whitgift, p. 54; Parker, p. 463.

having conducted his work through the press, presented a copy to the lord treasurer, accompanied by the following address:—

"I am bound to offer you my book of 'Defence' against the late 'Replye' of T. C., not doubting that your lordship will receive it with the same mind that it is given you. Although I know that your leisure will not serve you to peruse it through, yet, if it shall please your lordship sometimes to read it, I doubt not that you will soon perceive how little cause there is so grievously to accuse this Church of England, and so bitterly to inveigh against such lawful, godly orders, and kind of government as are used in the same. And surely if nothing else, yet the manifest untruths uttered in the 'Replye,' not only in falsifying and corruptly alleging ancient authorities, and abusing of holy Scriptures, but also in the slenderness and weakness of the reasons therein used, may move those that are godly, quiet, and learned, to the utter misliking of the platform that cannot be builded but with such timber. I am so well assured of my doctrine that I am not only well content to sustain this pain and labour, but the envy also of divers persons, and the manifest injury of cursed tongues. The which, notwithstanding, I shall the more easily bear, if I may still enjoy (whereof I doubt not) your lordship's accustomed goodness.

"It becometh me not, neither is it needful, to move your lordship to be zealous in the cause; for you know better what you have to do herein than I am able to inform you; only this I am assured of, that, if they should be suffered to proceed as they have begun, nothing else in the end can be looked for than confusion both of the church and of the *state*. But *convenient discipline*, joined with doctrine, being duly executed, will soon remedy all; for sects and schisms can by no means abide these two, neither will they long continue where they are not by some in authority cherished and maintained. This, experience and the story of all ages teach to be true. The Lord give peace to his church! The Lord preserve your lordship, and govern you with his Holy Spirit, that you may long live profitably to his church and honourably to your country! From Trinity College in Cambridge, the 5th day of February, 1574. To your lordship most bound, and for ever to be commanded."*

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xviii. art. 26.

It is not difficult to ascertain what the doctor meant by saying that, if the puritans were "suffered to proceed," nothing else could be expected but "confusion both of church and state!" Mr. Cartwright and his brethren sought only, and in the most honourable way, the purification of the church from the abuses received from popery, and that its government and worship might be regulated by the holy Scriptures; but they explicitly and constantly proved their loyalty to the queen and their firm attachment to the civil constitution, absolutely disclaiming all interference, directly or indirectly, in matters of state. The doctor, however, was unable to understand how ecclesiastical abuses could be reformed without doing injury to both church and state! This, as already intimated, was the common delusion of the age, and is the fatal error to some extent at the present day.

The remedy which the doctor prescribed for curing the supposed evils here stated, was as remarkable as his want of information. What could he mean by affirming that "convenient discipline, joined with doctrine, being duly executed," would soon remedy all? Did he intend to bring into universal operation those powerful engines which he and his colleagues had so successfully employed in the university? Such intolerant measures might put out the eyes of the people—they could not enlighten their minds; they might be found prejudicial to their worldly interests—they could not benefit their souls; they might be expected from the tyrannizing Roman pontiff—they could not proceed from apostolical origin. The professed ministers of Jesus Christ, reposed in the lap of peace under the government of a protestant princess, ought certainly to have disclaimed all such theological warfare as belonging to the papal antichrist alone.

Whitgift's work is entitled, "The Defence of the Answere to the Admonition, against the Replye of T. C.," 1574, printed in black letter, containing upwards of eight hundred folio pages. The author, in the preface, makes this solemn protestation:—

"I only speak as Mr. Zuinglius did to the magistrates in his time. If it be lawful for *every man to publish abroad among the people those things which he hath devised of his own head before he hath consulted with the church,* nay *against the authority of the whole church,* in a short time we shall see more errors in the church than

there are faithful men and Christians. If we suffer every heady and brainless fellow, so soon as he hath conceived any new thing in his mind, to publish it abroad, gather disciples, and make a new sect, in a short time we shall have so many sects and factions that Christ, which with great pain and labour is brought to unity in every church, would be divided again into many parts. Wherefore, as you have singularly and with great wisdom and labour already restored the true religion of Christ, and banished all superstition and erroneous doctrine, so likewise in these perilous times, wherein Satan seeketh so busily to entrap us, look well about you, note the crafts and subtilties of them, take heed of the pestilent winds of divers doctrine, let none trouble the gospel among you or set you at strife and variance."

If the doctor had recollected the principles of the leading Reformers, as already noticed, or even his own principles when he was a Reformer, he would probably have found sufficient reason for correcting the inaccurate statements contained in this extract. Soon after Whitgift's book came from the press, a small duodicimo volume was published, probably anonymous, entitled, "An Examination of Mr. D. Whitgift's censure entitled 'The Defence of the Answere to the Admonition.'"* Mr. Cartwright, having retired from his native country, found refuge in a foreign land. His exile commenced a few weeks before the publication of Whitgift's "Defence;" but, from the nature of the work, and the manner of its execution, he might justly anticipate a reply. The freedom of the English press was so far suppressed, that the publication of works recommending the removal of ecclesiastical abuses was stigmatized sedition, or conspiracy against the state! But the right of private judgment, though unknown in England, was happily secured and enjoyed in the continental churches. The English refugees who fled from the persecution of bloody Mary enjoyed this privilege, endeared to every man as the gift of Heaven; and Mr. Cartwright, who fled from the severities of Elizabeth, enjoyed this hallowed benefit which his native country denied him. During his exile he composed and published "The Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright, against Maister Doctor Whitgifte's Second Answer touching the Church Discipline," 1575. The work is printed

* Herbert's Ames, vol. iii. p. 1644.

in a rude black letter, containing six hundred and sixty-six pages in quarto, but without printer's name or place of abode. Though there can be no doubt that it was the production of a foreign press, yet it contains only a part of this branch of the great controversy. The author afterward published "The Rest of the Second Replie," 1577, which may not be improperly called the *second* part of his "Second Replie;" containing two hundred and sixty-five pages in quarto, printed in a Roman letter.

The author, in his dedication, "To the Church of England, and all that love the truth in it," remarked that "it is showed in his book, not only that the doctor hath a similar cause with the papists, but the very same cause as the grossest papists,—I say the grossest, for that in some points, as of the church's election and pastoral residence, there are of them more favourable to the truth than he, who, joining with catholic writers both old and of our time, have written against the estate of the popish church in that behalf."

The doctor had accused him of having read scarcely any of the authors he had cited:* to which Mr. Cartwright replied, that he would pass over the question of great reading, but added, "If you be learned, and I be not—if you have read them all, and I scarcely one, it will appear to the learned; but this, as I have said, toucheth not the cause. Only I admonish you that you do it hereafter on better ground. As to my speeches of archbishops and others, if all were taken both in this and the former book against their persons, which I spoke only against their offices, the accusation would be altogether untrue." Further addressing the doctor, he said, "If what I said was sharper than you liked, you should not think it much to be struck with the back of the sword who have smitten others with the edge, nor to be lightly pricked who have thrust others through, in taking from them as much as in you lay all opinion of godliness and learning. You doubt whether I meant in good faith what I said when I called you a brother; take heed lest in giving no credit to others you leave no place for others to give any to you. But, according to you, my reproaches cannot be excused. It is not meet that I should sit in judgment on my own modesty; it is also unreasonable that you

* Whitgift's Defence, p. 207.

the party grieved should. As self-love may blind my eyes, and not only prevent me seeing my blemish, but to think it an ornament, so may displeasure dazzle your eyes and cause your judgment to decline too much on the other side."

The doctor wrote professedly in defence of the church and of his former publication; but, in advocating the prerogative of princes to devise and establish religion, it is questionable whether he will obtain the thanks of all modern churchmen. He wisely disclaims an apostolical origin, so much applauded and idolized by those who ought to know better, rejecting the chimerical notion as opposed to the clearest historical records, and as the fantastic opinion of persons far too zealous for the legislative establishment. "It is indeed true," observes the doctor, "that, in the apostles' time, princes did *not meddle* in causes ecclesiastical, except by *persecution!* They were then infidels, not Christians—persecutors, not professors; and therefore, if all ought of necessity to be reduced to the form of government used in the apostles' time, Christian princes must be delivered from that care, and be content to forego that portion of their authority." He charges Mr. Cartwright with considering the church and the commonwealth as distinct bodies, and as requiring distinct government.* And what intelligent man will doubt the correctness of this distinction? To exhibit the prominent features of this branch of the discussion, it will be necessary, as in the former part of the controversy, to reduce the subject as much as possible to an easy method, so as to place before the reader a lucid statement of the principal points at issue as contained in the following particulars:—

1. *Head of the Church.*

The two disputants delivered their sentiments on this subject with their wonted freedom and confidence of success. Dr. Whitgift thus addressed his opponent: "You say that the civil magistrate is not *the head* of the church, and that Christ only and properly is the head, for it is his body; but in respect of the external society of it, and the supreme authority which God hath given to the prince over his people in all causes, he may also in that respect be called the head of the church.

* Whitgift's Defence, p. 7.

Jesus Christ is the only archbishop and bishop in respect to his *spiritual government,* which he keepeth to himself, and that all others are under him and have their authority from him; but this name may be aptly given to those who have the oversight of other bishops in the external government of the church, in which the magistrates are called gods.

"The church may be established without the magistrate touching true faith and spiritual government by Christ in the hearts and consciences of men, but not touching the visible society and the external government. Upon this confusion is that grounded, that the church in respect of Christ is a monarchy. For when I said that the state of the church was popular in the apostles' time, I spake of the outward form, show, and government of it; which therefore I call popular, because the church itself, that is *the whole multitude, had interest in almost every thing,* especially whilst the church yet remained at Jerusalem. So in the apostles' time, though they might be counted *Optimates,* yet, because *most things in government were done by the consent of the people, the state for that time was popular!*

"Christ is the head of the church, and governs it spiritually in the conscience; but because it hath also an outward and visible form, it requires an outward and visible government, which Christ doth execute as well by the *civil magistrate* as he doth by the ecclesiastical minister; and therefore the government of the church, in the external and visible form of it, is not merely spiritual. Christ governs by himself spiritually only, and by his ministers both spiritually and externally; therefore your reason is nothing."*

On the supremacy of Christ and the civil magistrate, Mr. Cartwright meets his opponent on open ground, saying, "The doctor confesses that Christ is the *only* head of the church. If Christ be the only head, then that which I set down, that the civil magistrate is head of the commonwealth, and not of the church, stands good. But if the magistrate be head of the church, then Christ is not the *only* head. Having, through fear of the outcry, made a little courtesy to the truth, he forthwith lifts up his heel against it, and will have the civil magistrate also head of the church;

* Whitgift's Defence, p. 182, 756.

from which infinite absurdities must follow. The doctrine of the apostle would by this means be entirely overthrown, which shows that this title, 'The Head of the Church,' was given to our Lord to exalt him above all powers, rulers, and dominions, in heaven or on earth. But if this title belong also to the civil magistrate, then it is manifest that there is a power on earth to which Jesus Christ is not superior. By the same reason that you may give the civil magistrate this title, you may say he is the first born of every creature, the first begotten of the dead, the Redeemer of his people whom he governs.

"The whole argument of the apostle shows that this title, 'The Head of the Church,' cannot be said of any creature, and is confirmed by the demonstrative article with which the Hebrews used to tie that which was verified of one to himself alone. Paul saith, 'He is *the* Head,' as if he had said he and none other is 'The Head of the Church.' But if the church be the body of Christ, and also of the civil magistrate, it must have *two heads*, which is certainly monstrous, and great dishonour of both Christ and his church. Christ is the chief and highest in his church, inseparably united to it; and as the head giveth sense and motion to all the body, so he quickeneth and, together with the knowledge of heavenly things, giveth strength to walk therein. When these are considered, it is manifest that not any one of these things agree, or can possibly agree to any creature in heaven or on earth, either towards the whole church or any particular assembly; so that the title, '*The* Head of the Church,' cannot without great violence be given to any mere creature.

"As it is certainly manifest in the Scripture that this title is too high to be given to any man, so hath it been confirmed by writers, old and new, who have held the honour of Christ in any convenient estimation. Let us therefore see whether this jealousy over the title of the Head of the church, not only in respect of the whole, but also in respect of a particular congregation, have their approbation. Cyprian saith, 'There is but *one* Head of the church.' The Bishop of Salisbury, as already particularly stated, affirms the same. Augustine proves that the minister who baptizeth cannot be the Head of him who is baptized, because 'Christ is the Head of the *whole* church.' He proves that St. Paul could

not be the head of the churches which he planted, because 'Christ is the Head of the whole body,' which reason could be of no force, if St. Paul or any creature might be Head of the church under Christ.

"Respecting the life and nourishment given, and spiritual blessings poured into the body of the church, you say, Christ is *only* Head; yet touching the external society and outward government, the magistrate also may be Head of the church. To overthrow the doctrine that Christ alone is the Head of his church, this distinction is brought, that, according to the inward influence of grace, Christ is the only Head; but, according to the outward government, this headship also belongs to others. But if there be no Head beside Christ in respect to the spiritual government, there can be no Head but Christ in respect of the word, sacraments, and discipline administered by those whom he hath appointed, because that is also his spiritual government. And even in the outward society and assemblies of the church, where two or three are gathered together in his name, either for hearing the word, or for prayer, or any other church exercise, our Saviour Christ being in the midst of them, must needs be there as their Head; and if he be there not idle, but doing the office of the Head fully, it must follow that, even in the outward society and assemblies of the church, no mere man can be called the Head of it. Seeing that our Lord performs the whole office of the Head himself *alone*, there is nothing left to men by the doings of which they may obtain that title. Whosoever therefore seeks to benefit the church according to his calling, and does any thing for the preservation of this body, he does it as an eye, an arm, an ear, or as some other member, and not as its *Head*.

"Those who attempt to gratify princes with the spoil of Jesus Christ are found to dishonour them by leaving them no place in the church of Christ; for if the magistrate be head of the church of Christ which is within his dominions, then he cannot be a member of it, because every member of the church is a member of the body, and he who is not of the body can be no member of the church. As the godly magistrate who is head of the commonwealth brings singular commodity, so do the godly pastors who are officers of the church. While they conquer rioting, adultery,

covetousness, pride, and idleness by the ministry of the word, they may well be called the horsemen and chariots of the commonwealth. But the pastors cannot therefore be said to be officers of the commonwealth; no more can the magistrate who affords singular assistance to the church be properly called the officer of the church."*†

2. *Archbishops.*

The two disputants must be allowed to state their views concerning archbishops. "Although the name archshepherd or archbishop," says the doctor, "be proper to Christ, as he is not only the *chief* shepherd, but the *only* shepherd to whom the sheep do properly appertain, and to whom all the other shepherds must of necessity submit, in whose name, and under whom only, the church is governed, yet, in respect of the external policy of the church, and of pastors and bishops who are to be kept and directed in such things as pertain to their duty, the name of archbishop may *aptly* and *fitly* be attributed to him who hath the ordering and direction of the rest in the external government of the church.

"While you confound the spiritual and external regimen of the church, you confound both yourself and your reader. In the spiritual regimen Christ is the only pastor, and all others are his sheep; in the external regimen there are many other pastors. In the spiritual regimen Christ is the only archbishop, governeth all, and to whom all others must make their account; but in the external government there are many archbishops, as the state of every church requires. In the spiritual government Christ is the only

* Cartwright's Second Replie, p. 411—420. † Mr. Hooker, stating his views of the headship of Christ, says, "God hath given unto him the ends of the earth for his possession, dominion from sea to sea, all power both in heaven and in earth, such sovereignty as doth not only reach over all places, persons, and things, but doth rest in his own only person, and is not by any succession continued. He reigneth as Head and King, nor is there any kind of law which tieth him but his own proper will and wisdom. His power is absolute, the same jointly over all which it is severally over each—not so the power of any other headship. So that unto him is given, by the title of Headship over the Church, that largeness of power wherein neither man nor angel can be matched or compared with him. Christ, being Lord and Head over all doth by virtue of that sovereignty rule all; so he hath no more a superior in governing his church than in exercising sovereign dominion upon the rest of the world." The author, however, adds, "The headship which we give unto kings is altogether visibly exercised, and ordereth only the external frame of the church affairs amongst us!"—*Hooker's Eccl. Polity*, vol. iii. p. 284, 285.

prince, king, and judge, and, in respect of him, all others are subjects; but in the external government there are several countries, several kings, princes, magistrates, and judges. In the spiritual kingdom of Christ and government of his church there is no respect of persons, but all are equal; but in the external government there are, and must be, degrees of persons. In respect of Christ and his spiritual government there is neither magistrate nor archbishop; but in respect of men and the external government of the church there are both, and that according to *Christ's own order!* So that now you may perceive your error to be in not rightly distinguishing the states and times of the church and its government.

"It is manifest that Christ hath left the government of his church touching the external policy to the ordering of men, who have to make orders and laws for the same as time, place, and persons require, so that nothing be done contrary to his word! We make not an archbishop necessary to salvation, but profitable for the government of the church, and therefore consonant to the word of God. We know the church of Christ is not builded upon any man, either as upon foundation or pillars, but upon Christ and his word, which remain immoveable. We know also that the same church may stand without the external help of man; yet hath God appointed functions in his church, both ecclesiastical and *civil*, as means to keep it in external peace, discipline, and order, and though he hath not expressed the names, yet hath he allowed the offices! Among men, the chief pillar that upholds the church is the Christian prince and magistrate; and yet where have you in the gospel any such express mention made thereof as there is in the appointing of the tabernacle, besoms, snuffers, &c.? We know that all things necessary to salvation are much more plainly expressed in the gospel than in the law. We are also well assured that Christ in his word hath fully and plainly comprehended all things requisite to faith and good life; yet hath he committed certain orders of ceremonies and kind of government to the disposition of his church, the general rules given in his word being observed, and nothing being done contrary to his will and commandment.

"What if the name of an archbishop were not in St. Paul's time? Doth it therefore follow that the thing signified by the name was

not in his time? The authority and thing whereof the archbishop hath his name was in St. Paul's time, therefore the name is lawful; and if it had not been in his time, yet were both the name and the office lawful, because it pertains to the external policy and government of the church. In the apostles' time there was joined the administration of discipline with the ministry of the word and sacraments; therefore it may be so likewise now in archbishops and bishops. That authority and government which the apostles had in their time is now *for the most part* executed by archbishops and bishops, which is the overthrow of your assertion!

"Men may *add* ministries to those that are appointed, and break not the will and commandment of God, because they may be helps and furtherances to those ministries which he has appointed; but they cannot take away such ministries as God has placed in his church to be perpetual without breach of his will and commandment. To those ministries which God has appointed in his word as necessary at all times, those may be *added* that be *convenient* for some times; and yet the church, which hath authority to add these, hath not authority to take away the others. The Church of England, God's name be praised, hath all points of necessary doctrine certainly determined, ceremonies and orders expressly prescribed, from which neither archbishop nor bishop may swerve, and according to which they must be directed; to the observing of which, also, their duty is to *constrain all those* that are under them. So that whosoever shall wilfully and stubbornly sever himself from obedience, either to archbishop or bishop in such matters, may justly be called a schismatic, or a disturber of the church!" *

These are the doctor's opinions and arguments in defence of the office and jurisdiction of those archbishops which Queen Elizabeth was pleased to plant in the Church of England. The doctor having spoken freely on the subject, Mr. Cartwright must be allowed similar advantage. He observes that "the doctor's Answer was very faulty, since it rent asunder things which ought not to be separated, dividing the government of the church, by pastors and others, from the spiritual government; for when the ecclesiastical ministry hath respect to the soul, as it is called the ministry of the Spirit, and is spiritual, they who execute it are called ministers of

* Whitgift's Defence, p. 301—470.

the kingdom of heaven, and the preaching, excommunication, and other discipline which they use are spiritual: this separation of the outward government of the church from the spiritual, and making them opposite members, doth not distinguish, but destroy the government of Christ. Where our Lord governs his church spiritually, both by his word and Spirit, he placeth his spiritual government in touching the hearts of the elect by his Spirit. Our Saviour useth the external ministry of men not only in the distribution of his word, but also of his Spirit; yet the doctor makes the external ministry to serve only for the dispensation of the word, and not of the Spirit. Whereas he ought to have considered, that as Christ sitteth in heaven, and now teaches by the mouth of the ministry, so he giveth his Spirit by the same ministry; on which account it is called the ministry of the Spirit. Seeing, therefore, that Christ's external government of his church is spiritual, and even that inward touch of the Spirit of God is not ordinarily, but by the subordinate ministries which God has appointed, it is manifest that the distinction, "that Christ hath no subordinate pastors underneath him in the spiritual government" is not true.

"I must needs prove that the crow is black, or that the archbishopric is a new ministry. That which hath diverse efficient causes is another thing and diverse; but there are diverse efficient causes of the ministry of the archbishop, from those expressed in the word of God. That there are diverse efficient causes is manifest; for the office of bishop, elder, and deacon was appointed by God, but the office of the archbishop was devised by man. This is sufficient proof to those who have their senses exercised in the holy Scriptures.

"It cannot be proved that Timothy and Titus had any such authority over the rest, as the doctor has represented:* but the doctor affirms that the office of a bishop is superior to the office of a pastor; and if so, it is not the same. But why dare not the doctor as well confess that the church may erect a new ministry,

* Sir Francis Knollys, addressing Lord Burghley, said, "I know but one chaplain to her Majesty that would write with such audacity against the plain truth of Scripture. For he saith, That because St. Paul appointed Timothy and Titus to ordain elders in every congregation, he therefore takes it to be proved that they had superiority over other elders. The Scripture maketh no mention that either Timothy or Titus were bishops or that they had superiority over other elders."—*Lansdowne MSS.* vol. lxi. art. 57.

seeing he in effect affirms as much? To prove the archbishop, he alleges that the church may appoint other names and offices besides those mentioned in Scripture. I would gladly know, first, when the church appoints an office that never existed before, whether or not it be a *new* office? and then, whether a new office be a new ministry? And, if to erect an office which never existed before, be to erect a new office, and a new office be a new ministry, it must follow that the church, in erecting another office than is set forth in the Scripture, erects a new ministry. The doctor is afraid to confess a new ministry, and not afraid to confess a new office; of which superstition I would gladly understand some reason.

"He would have our Saviour's care over the church in the time of the gospel to consist in having set down the doctrine in all points more plainly than under the law. This being a doctrine of salvation under the law, that there should be ministers in the church, it follows from his own saying, that he hath in all points set it down more plainly now than under the law; therefore this point, how many orders and degrees of ministry ought to be in the church of God, considering that which was precisely defined in the law, is more narrowly prescribed in the gospel. Thus, having defended more in deed than you dare set down in words, you are almost continually fighting against yourself, and scarcely at any time are your proofs and propositions of one measure.

"The doctor supposes he may escape by the distinction of external things and variable circumstances. I have before showed that all external things are not variable; and he must remember, that he, making the archbishop's office to begin in the time of the apostles, hath drawn out his continuance to the present time, and hath accounted him during this period as a principal pillar in the church of God. If then he be such a profitable officer, both in the purest and most corrupt time of the church, in persecution and in peace, under a Christian magistrate and under a tyrant, it is clear that this is an office not variable by circumstances, but which our Saviour might as well have established in perpetuity as the unchangeable ministries of bishops and deacons. In calling it a servile tie to have the whole government under the prescript of God's word, he forgets that the greatest liberty and freedom of

Christians is to serve the Lord according to his revealed will, and in all things to hang upon his mouth. We therefore see that leaving things to the ordering of the church, and their variable circumstances, will not hold in the case of archbishops, nor in the ordinary government of the church. If the magistrate were an officer of the church, and not of the commonwealth, it would appear from the Scriptures, seeing there are so many places which describe his office, and every circumstance pertaining to him. If the doctor can bring only one place for his archbishop, this controversy will be ended. It was therefore sufficient to have mentioned my Answer, without the refutation of all these positions with which he has ventured throughout to make an answer.

"If it be granted that the office of the pope is unprofitable to the church, because St. Paul makes no mention of it in the ministries requisite for building the church, so likewise, as there is no mention of the office of an archbishop, it must necessarily follow that the archbishop is unprofitable: if there be the same cause, there must be the same effect. The reason added, that the pope does things which the archbishop does not, and claims things which the archbishop does not, is of no force at all. The question is not concerning the abuse and tyranny of the pope; but whether, if it be unprofitable for one to govern all the churches in the world, is it not unprofitable for one to govern all those in a province? By the doctor's answer, the office of pastors is unlawful when they challenge to themselves unlawful things, and the pope's office good and lawful, if he, being ruler over all the church, would abstain from those things which he notes down. The contrary whereof is true. As the pastor's office cannot by any outrage of the pastor be made unlawful, so the dominion of one over all, be it ever so moderate and qualified, can never be lawful. If the archbishop should challenge those things in his province which the pope challenges over the world, he would by this reason be as unlawful an officer as the pope; therefore the difference between the archbishop and the pope, being accidental, and not touching the nature of the government, is unjustly alleged: yet it is the refuge in which the doctor is frequently compelled to hide himself.

"It ought to be further observed that the doctor's answer concerning the office of the archbishop being in the apostles' time is the defence with which the pope's title of universal bishop is maintained. This is Harding's answer to the Bishop of Salisbury, that although the name of universal bishop was not at first given to the pope, yet the authority was. Then he flies to the old refuge, the prince; and there seeks cover for the archbishop, asking whether he shall have no authority in the church because he was not in St. Paul's time? Though St. Paul had said that our Saviour, immediately after his ascension, had given princes to his church, as the doctor saith he gave archbishops, they must have had authority then or never after; so, if our Saviour, when he ascended and, in St. Paul's time, gave archbishops, they must have received their authority then or never after. It was not in the power of the apostles to appoint Christian princes; but it was in their power to have provided the church with archbishops, if they had been at all needful, and, seeing they so greatly promoted the building of the church, they would have been inexcusable in not appointing them.

"The doctor observed that certain offices instituted of God endured for a time, therefore men may devise *new* offices. But where is the strength of this argument? Is it in this, that because God instituted offices for a time, therefore man may? or in this, that God abrogated certain offices, therefore man may institute them? Which soever you say, and you must say one, the absurdity is apparent. In each case, the comparison is made between the authority of God and the authority of man. As great a distance as there is between them, so great a difference there is between your argument and a just conclusion. Thus we reason against the papists that God did not abrogate his own ceremonies in order that men might establish others. If he wished to have ceremonies, he would have preferred his own: so it may be said that God did not cut off his own ministries to make room for others; and, if more ministries of preaching and governing had been necessary, besides doctors and pastors, he would have kept his own rather than accept those which men have devised.

"The doctor hath said that the office and authority of the archbishop was in the apostles' time. If this be true, how did the

archbishop receive his authority from their death? Having it before, he could not receive it by their departure. One of these is untrue, that the archbishop exercises the same authority as did the apostles; or, that the office of the archbishop was in the apostles' time; or, that, having in the apostles' time the authority which he now hath, by their death he obtained that which the apostles had. How near this approaches to the papacy the reader will consider. But, if the archbishop succeed to the administration of the order and government of the apostles, why doth he not show his evidence? why doth he not bring forth his records of bequest or designation, that it may appear that he is not entered in as a trespasser?

"If the church without the archbishop and archdeacon be a body consisting of all the parts, comely joined together, wherein nothing is wanting and nothing is superfluous, then it follows that the offices are neither ornamental nor advantageous to the church, but constitute an unprofitable excrescence, both to the disfiguring and hindrance of the growth of the body. The order and policy of the church being one part of the body, if it be not whole and complete, but standeth in need of the archbishop and archdeacon, it must carry this absurdity with it, that there being one member imperfect without them the body of Christ is not perfect. The perfection of the body must be measured by the will of him whose body it is, that is Christ. When he gave apostles, evangelists, and others, he made it appear that he would not have his body perfect without them; so when he took them away from his church, he made it known that the body was perfect without them. If apostles and evangelists had been put down by the authority of man, it might have helped the doctor; that, as men put down ministries, so they might supply the church with new ministries. But, seeing they were taken away by the Lord, this his reason, that because God taketh away ministries, men may *add* them, hath no strength in it. He who hath authority to make laws, hath also to abrogate them; he who may absolve, may condemn; he who may bind, may loose; he who hath power to add, hath power to diminish. But mark what he answers: The question is, Whether men may add to the ministries appointed by Jesus Christ? The argument whereby I prove that they cannot is, because it is not lawful

for them to diminish. When the doctor answers that 'men may *add,*' is not his answer the question to be decided? and does he not take that for proof which is to be proved? As to the *added* ministries being helps to ministries appointed by God, it is the point in dispute, being as doubtful as the rest. The papists may as well affirm this for multiplying their sacraments as the doctor for increasing his ministries. He saith that men may take away offices of God which are temporal, but not perpetual. This is abused. Neither any man, nor all the men in the world, could put down the temporal ministries of the apostles, evangelists, and others, which the Lord ordained; therefore they continued so long in the church, until, by their death, without raising up others, He declared that they had an end.

"The doctor, by one push, thrusts the archbishop quite out of the church. If it be a good reason to conclude there were no deacons amongst the Jews because they were not specified in the Old Testament, then it is true that because there is no archbishop specified in the New Testament, there was no archbishop in the apostle's times. The office of archbishop, which is said to be the office of order, confounds and changes all order—an evangelist into a bishop, a bishop into an archbishop, an archbishop into an apostle, and an apostle into an archbishop. If St. John were an archbishop, or performed an archbishop's office in those places where he abode, then the other apostles in their circuits did the same, and were likewise archbishops over the people and the bishop there. So it follows that, if there were any, they had nothing to do, their offices not being yet in existence, except in the hands of the apostles. And, if the doctor will needs have St. John's authority as the rod by which to measure the archbishop's authority, it must follow that as he is said to have had the care and oversight of *all the churches* the archbishop must have the same.

"To prove that the name of archbishop was not before the council of Nice, nor within three hundred years after the ascension of our Saviour, I show that there is no mention of him in Theophilus, Ignatius, Clemens Alexandrinus, Justine Martyr, Irænens, Tertullian, Origin, Cyprian, the histories out of which Eusebius gathered his story, nor in Eusebius, nor in any allowed writer, Greek or Latin, within that period. The doctor asks whether the council of

Nice, Antioch, and Epiphanius be not good?—all of which are later than those I alleged, and after the three hundred years before assigned. So that to prove the antiquity of the *name* of archbishop and metropolitan, he saith, in effect, it is all one to allege the writers which came after as those which went before; and, to prove that these names were *within* three hundred years after Christ, he alleges those writers which testify these titles to have been *after* three hundred years: but how absurd this is all men will understand. To prove that these names were within three hundred years and little more, when not one writer having so often occasion to speak of them doth once mention them, may be considered partly from what is said by the Bishop of Salisbury. He asked Harding, 'Was there no man in the world, for the space of six hundred years, able to express the name of universal bishop?' So I ask the doctor, Was there none in the world, for the space of three hundred years and more, able to express the metropolitan's name—no man, for the space of almost four hundred years, able to express the archbishop's name?

"The doctor must understand that his writers adduce nothing to prove that antiquity which he supposes; and, being further from the apostles' time, and nearer the time of antichrist, are not of so good credit to prove the lawfulness of that office or name as if they had been supported by the testimony of purer times. Of the six authors which he mentions, two wrote after four hundred years; all the rest wrote from about three hundred and fifty to four hundred. Although he hath brought so small a number, yet he must be glad to cut off half of them as those which make no mention of the archbishop, since neither Chrysostome nor Jerome, nor Ambrose, make mention of him.

"He cites Gregory Nazianzen, that Cyprian ruled not only the church of Carthage, but also the churches of Africa, Spain, and almost the whole eastern parts; on which it is to be observed that, where the doctor seeks by sea and land for bishops of the largest spread and longest arms, he hath at last met with one which hath more than he would have to be known. Why hath he concealed the rest of Gregory's sentence? Why hath he cut off the feet of it? Why hath he pared Nazianzen's words? As I have not the book, I will set it down as the Bishop of Salisbury has done:

'Cyprian was a bishop, the mightiest and noblest of all bishops; for he had rule not only over the church of Carthage and Africa, but over all the West, and in a manner over all the East, likewise over both North and South.' This one assertion, that Cyprian was metropolitan of almost all the east, west, north and south, overthrows whatsoever the doctor hath said on these points. The wide spread of Cyprian's archbishopric hath swallowed up all the rest, and made them all mere suffragans; and by this reckoning, not only must men pass the sea, but main seas, to have an end of their causes. And, if what he saith be true, let him tell us why the Bishop of Rome may not have a sovereignty over all churches as well as the Bishop of Carthage? Therefore, unless he will overthrow all that he has endeavoured to establish; and unless, in travailing of an archbishop, he will be delivered of a pope, and a pope of the largest size, he must be compelled to give up his archbishop. The Bishop of Salisbury, in reply to Harding's objection, that the primates had authority over inferior bishops, answers, 'They had it by agreement and custom; but neither by Christ, nor Peter, nor Paul, nor by any *right* of God's word.' This not only confirms that which I propounded of not varying from the godly writers, but also shows the doctor's untrue statement of their being instituted by the apostles; also that their institution, with authority over others, was *unlawful*, having no manner of warrant from the word of God.

"It remains to be shown, that the archbishopric hath been so far from nourishing the peace of the church that it hath been the knife with which the church hath been cut in pieces. To prove that this point of keeping peace in the church is one of those principles which requires a pope over all archbishops, as well as an archbishop over all the bishops, I need go no farther than the causes which the doctor has assigned. Where it is shown that unity may be preserved without an archbishop, he assigns two reasons why it is meet to have an archbishop. The one is, 'to call bishops together when there is variance;' the other, 'to put them in mind of their duties.' Then, if an archbishop be necessary for calling a *provincial* council, when there is cause of an assembly, and when the bishops are divided, it is necessary there be also a pope, who may call a *general* council, when there is division among the archbishops,

which is equally a cause of a general council. For when the churches of one province are divided from others, and the archbishops are at variance, as you ask me, so I ask you who shall assemble them together? who shall admonish them of their duties, when they are assembled? If you can find a way how this may be done without a pope, you will find a way to disburden the church of archbishops.

"How will you prove that the archbishop may transfer his charge, or any part of it, to others? May he commit it to the archdeacon, or to his chancellors? And may not the pope communicate his charge to his cardinals, as well as the archbishop to his suffragans and others? If he can show no reason why he may do it, but only that it is the constitution of the church, by the same reason the universal bishop may discharge his office by his deputies.

"Where he saith, 'The universal bishop cannot ordain ministers, preach, and suppress heresies, so well through all the church as an archbishop in a province,' I have showed them both to be impossible; which is here confessed, when he is constrained to lay one part of his duty upon the shoulders of the suffragan, and another part upon his archdeacons. But, if he be able to bear all himself, why doth he commit them to others? if he cannot bear them, why doth he take so much upon him? If the pope deserve condemnation for taking more upon him than he is able to perform, the archbishop and the bishops, which therein bear him company, cannot be separated from him; so this reason brought against the pope standeth equally against them. As the pope cannot dispatch his affairs in the whole church, nor the archbishop in a province, so cannot the archbishop in his province so well as a bishop in his diocese, nor he in his diocese so well as a bishop of a particular congregation. The doctor's answer therefore, which shuts out the pope, in like manner shuts out the archbishop and the lord-bishop."*†

* Cartwright's Second Replie, p. 409—586. † Mr. Hooker states his sentiments on the necessity of archbishops: "It hath seemed, in the *eyes of reverend antiquity*, a thing most requisite that the church should not only have bishops, but even amongst bishops some to be in authority chiefest." He says, the "superiority of one bishop over another was requisite to the church," which rendered the institution of archbishops necessary! This author's statements clearly show that archbishops were neither prescribed in Scripture nor of God's appointment, but were devised by expediency and as matters of supposed convenience!—*Hooker's Eccl. Policy*, vol. iii. p. 132, 135, 139.

3. *The Election of Ministers.*

The doctor said he "condemned not those churches which appointed any order for electing pastors which they considered most profitable, because no certain form of election was prescribed in Scripture, and because all churches might do as to them seemed most expedient! That kind of election might be most profitable to the churches of Geneva, France, and others, which would be most hurtful to the Church of England; therefore, though this *popular* kind of election was convenient or profitable in the time of the *apostles*, yet, in this state of the Church of England, it would be pernicious and hurtful! There was then no church established in any civil government, because the magistrates did not then defend, but persecute, the church. The church, in the apostles' time, was established in doctrine most perfectly—in discipline, government, and ceremonies, as was convenient for that time, and as the church may be in time of persecution: but the time was not come whereof the prophet said, 'Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and Queens shall be thy nursing mothers;' therefore it was not established in any civil government, neither did it so publicly and openly show itself. The gospel and the church were in Queen Mary's time here in England; but they were persecuted, not established, not maintained, not allowed, nor professed by the public magistrate and the laws of the land; therefore there must be a great difference between the government of it then and the government of it now, the outward show of it then and the outward show of it now, the placing of ministers then and the placing of them now.

"All this verifies my assertion, and proves plainly that the manner and form of calling and electing ministers is, and hath been, in the power of the *civil* magistrate to order as shall be most expedient for the state of the church. If the prince think it convenient that the people should have voices in such elections, they may have them; if not, there is no law of God to bind them. It is no derogation at all from the apostolic church to have the orders of it in *divers points altered!* Though they were then most convenient, yet they are not so now in respect of this state and time, and these persons; so that the form of the apostolic churches was then *perfect* and *absolute*, though now it admits of *alteration!!**

* Whitgift's Defence, p. 170—215.

"All the doctor's reasons," observed Mr. Cartwright, "were alleged to prove that the election of ministers under a Christian magistrate cannot be safely and conveniently committed to the church, and that in these times it would be pernicious. But that which cannot be safely and conveniently done ought not to be done, much less that which is pernicious. If the church's election should be taken away because of contentions which happen in them, monarchy, which has often declined to tyranny and been abused to oppression, would have had an end long ago, and other most lawful and necessary aids ought to be taken away as those which are abused. The doctor, defending the same cause with the papists, uses the same armour, burnished with the names of Zuinglius, Calvin, and Beza; and here he hath the very same reason which the papists use for the bishop's sole election, to which Calvin makes this answer. To the saying of the papists that the people were shut out because of contentions and tumults which oftentimes happened, he confesses there were such motions and stirs; but that the taking away of the church's election was introduced as a remedy against those stirs, he affirms to be a plain untruth, and shows that there were other ways of curing those disorders by punishing those who moved tumults. He shows the true cause of taking away this privilege from the churches.

"The same appears from the authority of the Acts of the Apostles, where Peter speaks to the people of ordaining a bishop in the place of Judas. It is manifest that the people not only had, but ought to have, the appointment of their minister, not by any custom or decree of men, but by the eternal word of God. Their right consists both in examining the life of him who is chosen, and in the approbation of him if they like him, or the refusal of him if they like him not, which Cyprian proves from the twentieth of Numbers, from this place, and from the sixth of Acts.

"If the examination of a deacon be necessary, it is much more necessary of a minister; but the doctor passes this by quietly without a word. His other saying, that there is no mention made of any trial, he holdeth still, asking 'What one word of trial is there?' I answer, that although there be not the word *try*, yet there is that which is of equal weight. The Greek word *look out* cannot but

imply a trial. If St. Luke had only used the simple verb, which in our tongue signifies *consider,* yet that of itself had force to lead the chusers to a trial of those whom they had chosen; but, by using the compound, he thereby laid upon them a greater necessity and a more careful diligence in the trial of them. If the apostles had not meant hereby to have called the church to a diligent search and trial of those who were to be chosen, they would have contented themselves by saying, '*Take* from among you.' Although the whole church had knowledge of those who were the fittest to be chosen to that office, which is both unlikely and almost impossible, seeing several thousands were lately added to the church, yet even those who are well known to us, when they are to be chosen to such great charges, are to be inquired into afresh: for that knowledge of a man which is sufficient to live with him in society, and in the common course of life, is not enough to promote him to dignity in the church; and that experience of one in whom we dare with confidence trust our weightiest affairs, is no sufficient reason why we should commit to him the Lord's matters. So that considering the weight of the ecclesiastical office, and the manifold dissimulations of men, with the dulness of our sight to discover them, there can be no fear of too much trial, even of those whom we think we know already. Although the whole church had knowledge of those who were apt for this office, yet the apostle's admonition, of diligently considering whom they chose, which could not be without trial, was not out of time.

"That which the apostles gave in charge to the church, that they should choose such as had testimony of their good conversation, pertains to their examination: for the church, in seeking *testimony* of their good conversation, tried them; and, unless this be trial, there is no trial in the Church of England, seeing that trial is by the testimony of certain persons. So I conclude that this place of Acts for the examination of the deacon is much more strong for the examination of the minister.

"I alleged that it was not safe, in so weighty a matter, to commit that to the power of one which may with less danger be done by many; which he endeavours to refute by stating that the bishop is of all others fittest for this business. Here the doctor is quite gone from the cause. The question is not whether he be of all

others *most* fit, but whether it be fit that he *alone* should do it. So that if he consider it a reason against the cause, it is this: The bishop is more able than any one to effect a good examination, therefore more able than a great many; more able than any one, therefore more able to effect it alone than when he hath others to assist him: which is all one as if he had said, The right hand is more expert in doing things than the left, therefore it is better to do them by that alone than with the assistance of the left. Let it be supposed that the bishop seeth more than ten thousand of the church; yet, if the church have any eye at all, and that being joined with his, he will see better than by his alone. This shows that he who is able to do something alone will, with the company and help of others, be able to do more. Unless you will have your bishop so full of sight that he can leave nothing unseen, and that he have received the Spirit without measure, which is only proper to the Saviour, you have yet brought nothing to show why he ought not to have the assistance of others in the examination of ministers.

"Beza saith that Timothy had not only no election of ministers, but he had not ordination in his power, and that which he did he did in the name of the rest of the eldership. When he saith, 'It belongeth chiefly to the office of the elders to choose to the offices of the church as often as they are void, and that he never found in any Christian church established that kind of election which is in the power of one,' it is clear that he utterly condemns as unwarranted, usurped, and tyrannical that election which is made by the bishop alone; and that this is one of the substantial points of a lawful ecclesiastical election, that it be done by the eldership. He also saith, 'It was the unchangeable purpose of the apostles to provide that the governors of the church should not be thrust upon the church against her will; that Paul and Barnabas, to the intent they would not bring tyranny into the church, permitted the election of the elders by the voices thereof; and that they bring tyranny into the church who, without consent of the people, call at their own pleasure any one to a public function in the church.' It is most manifest that Beza holds this as another substantial point of a lawful ecclesiatical election, that it be made with the people's consent. So that the election made by the bishop alone

receiveth of Beza two deadly wounds: one in the head; the other in the heart: one, because it is not as well done by the bishop as by the eldership; the other, because it is not done by the consent of the church.*

"If the doctor would have laid aside his inordinate desire of maintaining that which he hath once written, he would have found more just cause of circumspection in our elections than in those of the church. For if St. Paul, endowed with a gift of discerning spirits, would not take Timothy, who had been brought up from a child in the knowledge of the Scriptures, and had lived in all commendation from his infancy, into company of his ministry, without such diligent circumspection, how much less may a bishop, in authority inferior to him, and in the gift of discerning spirits not to be compared with him, receive into the ministry, on the testimony of one only, a man whom he hath not known before, however deficient may be his knowledge of the word of God?

"The testimony of Bullinger is not only unprofitable to the doctor, but also directly against his cause. 'That word,' the doctor observes from Bullinger, 'which signifies lifting up of hands, is so placed that we may understand that they were chosen by the voice of the people, or ordained by laying on of hands;' but the doctor suppressed the next words, 'I think both were done.' Thus it appears from Bullinger's opinion, that they both chose by voices, and the apostles laid on their hands; which directly overthrows the doctor, whose answer is, that unless the word there used only signify the ceremony of imposition of hands, and not the election of

* In the apostolic churches, says Hooker, "when there was not as yet any" one "placed over the people, all authority was in them all; but when they all had chosen certain 'persons' to whom the regiment of the church was committed, this power was not any longer in the hands of the whole multitude, but wholly in theirs who were appointed guides of the church." Were not those guides then elected by "the whole multitude?" But were they, after election, irresponsible, and the power given them unlimited? This author adds, "Wherefore, that which was done by the people for certain causes, before the church was not fully settled, may not be drawn out and applied unto a constant and perpetual form of ordering the church!" Here we look in vain for evidence of what is stated. The learned author furnishes no proof beyond his own affirmation. But surely the churches were "fully settled" by the apostles. Why does this writer say, "for certain causes" the people might not continue to have the ordering of their churches? If Jesus Christ invested them with that ordering, they, being faithful to their Lord and his churches, could not relinquish it for all the world.—*Hooker's Eccl. Polity*, vol. iii. p. 165.

voices, it falleth to the ground. Bullinger's saying that both were done is the strongest testimony against him."*†

4. *Bishops in every Congregation.*

The doctor boldly affirms "that it could not be proved from the words of Iræneus, nor from any other ecclesiastical writer, that the apostles placed bishops any where but in the principal towns and cities; to whom was committed the government of lesser towns and villages, and the appointment of their pastors. 'This,' he said, 'appeared from the examples of Timothy and Titus, and the words of Iræneus import the same.' But if they placed pastors in every hamlet, yet it doth not follow that there might not be some one in every diocese or province by whom these pastors should be directed, as Timothy at Ephesus, and Titus at Crete.

"The old canons and ancient fathers testify that, in one city, there ought to be only one bishop. Chrysostome told Sisinius that one city must have but one bishop. Neither are you able to show from Christ's time that there was ever allowed to be two bishops in one city. Neither can you find the word *episcopus* commonly used, except for that priest which is in degree over and above the next, notwithstanding *episcopus* is oftentimes called presbyter, because presbyter is the more general name: so that it is one thing to be a bishop, and another to be a priest; because every bishop is a priest, but every priest is not a bishop. I know these names are *confounded* in the Scriptures; but I speak according to the manner and custom of the church since the apostles' time: and this is not only my opinion, but other learned men affirm the same!

* Cartwright's Second Replie, p. 125—292. † When deacons were about to be adopted by the church of Christ, Mr. Hooker admits that they were chosen by the people; and, though the people exercised their choice in this ecclesiastical affair even under the direction of the apostles, yet he denies that they possessed "any ecclesiastical power!" On chosing ministers, he affirms that, in the Church of England, the people of every parish, in effect, choose their own minister, by their patrons choosing for them, since "their interest therein hath been by orderly means derived into the patron!" But what could be conceived more disorderly than for the churches to have surrendered their spiritual interest to others? So long as they maintained their responsibility to God in such matters, was not this surrender impossible? and was not this surrender of the church's power that which established the throne and dominion of the Roman antichrist?—*Hooker's Eccl. Polity*, vol. iii. p. 162, 169.

"The superiority of bishops is *God's own* institution, and it hath a *necessary* use in the church of God! It hath been, and may be abused; and it is and may be well used. All these glorious words of yours are but very words, and therefore as words I will commit them to the wind. This one thing that you say I cannot let pass, even that God ordained not only one bishop, but more than one in every church. What Scripture have you to prove that there should be more bishops than one in one church? What one example in all the primitive church have you to warrant this assertion?—nay, you have the whole practice of the church to the contrary, even from the beginning. James alone was Bishop of Jerusalem, Timothy of Ephesus, Titus of Crete, Clemens of Rome; and it hath been always accounted as monstrous to have two bishops in one city as to have two heads to one body. But such bold assertions, without proof, are meet principles for such a tottering and ruinous platform as you dream of!"*

In reply to these bold positions, Mr. Cartwright observes that "two questions seemed necessary to be decided: the one was, whether the word of God hath ordained that in every particular congregation there should be a bishop? which the doctor denies, and affirms that it appears from certain ecclesiastical writers, and the examples of Timothy and Titus, that the apostles appointed bishops only in principal towns and cities; the other is, whether there were allowed in one city two or more bishops? which he also denies, and affirms that the whole practice of the primitive church is against it. If these things be showed to have been ordained by the apostles, it must follow that this institution of God, banished by Satan, ought to be called home, and that all human authority and custom exalted against it must yield themselves prisoners. If a bishop, in the apostles' time and of their institution, was the bishop of one church only, it will follow that this usurped authority of bishops over their fellow-ministers increased by little and little, according to the measure of time further from that in which the apostles lived, and nearer to that in which antichrist was fully settled.

"That every particular church had a bishop, appears from Paul's Epistle to Timothy. Seeing the description which he gives of a

* Whitgift's Defence, p. 328—444.

bishop agrees to the minister of every congregation, and nothing is required of the one which is not of the other, it will follow that the minister of every congregation is the bishop thereof. The description agreeing with every one of them, the things described must also agree. The bishop in St. Paul's time was appointed to the same place as the deacons; but the deacons were assigned to a particular congregation, as appears from the testimony of the Scriptures. The corruption was afterward introduced, that every church had not its bishop; yet every church had its deacons. St. Paul assigning the bishop's charge and care over the church of God must have given him charge over the whole body of the church, or over a particular congregation, or the faithful company in one house: but he extended not his charge over all the church, which would have been to make a pope, not a bishop; neither did he restrain him to the faithful of one household: it follows, therefore, that he appointed the bishop to one particular church.

"The word *church* must have one of these significations; nor is it ever used otherwise in the epistles of St. Paul, or in the writings of St. Luke; and it is never once used to signify either province or diocess. When the apostles write of the company of believers in such a circuit, they always speak in the plural number, and call them the *churches*. If it can be shown that this word is applied by them to all the faithful in a province or diocess, I will give up this argument; but if that cannot be done, then the church assigned to St. Paul's bishop is a particular congregation.

"St. Paul, writing to Titus to appoint religious elders through every town, adds this reason, because 'a *bishop* must be unblamable.' Whereupon either every town must have a bishop, or his reason is not well chosen. In this case he would give his rule for one thing, and his reason for another; and it would come to pass that those churches which have no bishops might lawfully have slanderous and spotted elders, seeing his only reason why the elders of every town ought to be without reproach is because a *bishop* ought to be so. Where it is said that Paul and Barnabas appointed by voice elders in every church, either the bishop was ordained, or else the famous cities of Antioch, Iconium, and Listra, in the number of churches there mentioned, received no bishop. But the doctor admits that the apostles ordained bishops in the

principal cities and towns; therefore, under these words, 'they ordained *elders* by voice in every church,' must be understood that they ordained *bishops* in every church; and unless the doctor will deny that these were bishops, he must of necessity grant that other churches had bishops as well as they.

"The man whom the doctor supposes to be the true Ignatius says, 'that every church ought to have its altar, and every church a bishop.' Lest the doctor should interpret 'every church' to mean every diocess or province, it ought to be recollected that such signification of the word was unknown in those times; but the author's meaning is manifestly the contrary, declaring 'every church ought to have a communion table.' Unless, therefore, the doctor will say that it is meant there should be only one communion-table in a whole diocess or province, his argument is without effect; and if, as he would make us believe, this was the apostle John's scholar, then among the testimonies this may be deemed the principal.

"The doctor affirms that bishops were not placed in villages or small cities, because the smallness of the place oftentimes makes the person contemned; whereas it is meet that a bishop should be reverenced. By this reason there would be no minister of the word whatever in those places: for it is necessary that the minister have the reverence of his people as becometh the ambassador and steward of Christ; and, if the bishop look for more, he aims at a further mark than ever the word of God set up. But how comes it to pass that the Bishop of Canterbury is more esteemed than the Bishop of London, and he of Winchester than he of Norwich, if the size of the place cause the estimation of the bishop? When gentlemen and noblemen build their houses more commonly in small towns and solitary places, doth the doctor affirm that they lose thereby any part of their estimation?

"To the reasons which I brought to prove that the placing of bishops in villages and small towns could not bring them more into contempt, than the shining of the sun or the falling of the rain, in villages as well as in cities, breedeth contempt of those benefits; or that the name or authority of father given to the poor, as well as to the rich, maketh that ordinance of God to be slighted: yet he answers not a word. Where I further alleged

the foresight and wisdom of God, which would receive a great wound if, in the institution of a bishop for every church, he should not have foreseen this inconvenience, which the doctor on the pope's authority maintains, he asks, 'When and where?' I I trust I have showed him both. If he had either understood or remembered what he twice or thrice wrote before, when, with Jerome, he propounded to us that bishop and elder were by God's word *all one*, he would not have fallen into this extreme boldness of denying every thing which is opposed to his unadvised assertions. If it be the institution of God that every church should have a teaching elder, and that elder, according to Jerome's saying, which is allowed by him, was a bishop, it must needs follow that to have a bishop in every church is the institution of God. And because the doctor boweth so easily under the authority of men, that he esteems it the best proof, let him understand that this was the judgment of two of the most famous men in our land for many years, and they were executed for the testimony of the truth of God; one of whom, amongst other things, suffered for the cause now under consideration.

"The sixth article for which Dr. Barnes was condemned is: 'I will never believe, nor ever can believe, that one man may, by the law of God, be bishop of two or three cities, yea of a whole country; for it is contrary to the doctrine of St. Paul, who, writing to Titus, commandeth that he should ordain a bishop in every town.' Dr. Hooper, showing that one man may not have two livings, adds, 'But this is claw me, and I will claw thee. If the bishops permitted not their priests to have two benefices, it may be the priests would likewise say the bishop should be bishop only of one city. And, indeed, so it should be; and till magistrates bring them to that point, it will be as possible to find a bishop wade godly and simply through the Scripture, in all cases of religion, as to drive a camel through the eye of a needle. A great pity it is to see how far the office of a bishop is degenerated from the original in the Scripture. It was not so in the beginning, when bishops were at their best, as the epistle to Titus testifies that the apostle willed him to ordain a bishop in *every* city of Crete. In case there were love in them now, as there was then towards the people, they would say there is more to do in one city

than the best of them could do. They know the primitive church had no such bishops until the time of Silvester the First.' I now leave the indifferent reader to judge with how little knowledge or conscience the doctor hath affirmed that it can neither be showed by Scripture, nor confirmed by any ecclesiastical writer, or the practice of the primitive church, that either every church ought to have her bishop, or that there ought to be bishops in villages and small cities.*

"The other two questions remain, whether it can be showed by Scripture, and by the examples of the primitive church, that there were more bishops than one in one church. Of this we might in part have been eased, if the doctor, having fallen out with the truth, had not likewise fallen out with himself. Approving of the testimony of Jerome, who affirms elders and bishops to be *one*, and that the elders of a church chose one from amongst them, who only kept the name of bishop, he necessarily affirms that, before the time that this ordinance was established, there were divers bishops in one church. In saying the word bishop is not *commonly* used, but for him that is in degree above the rest, he at unawares confesses that there were divers bishops in some churches, although not *commonly*. Seeing I have showed by St. Paul's determination that he is a bishop who is apt to teach, to exhort, to convince false doctrine, and reprove corrupt manners, and that the doctor cannot

* The Lord Chancellor King, a writer of great candour and extensive research, decisively proves these important positions: That the ancient diocess was never said to contain *churches*, but only a *church*, or a single congregation.—That all the people of a diocess assembled together every Sunday in one place to celebrate divine service, and also to manage the affairs of the church.—That a bishop and pastor was the same, having charge of only one congregation.—That the bishop or pastor had only one communion-table in his diocess.—That all the people of a diocess were present at church censures; and no offender was restored again to the church, nor any member received into communion, without the knowledge and consent of the whole diocess.—That the ordination of a minister was approved by the judgment and sufferage of the whole church.—That when a bishop died, all the members of the church assembled together in one place to choose a new bishop.—That the greatest bishoprics in the world, even in the third century, were only single congregrations.—That bishops were settled not only in cities or large towns, but also in country villages, wherever believers were in sufficient number to form a congregation. The primitive bishops were pastors of separate churches, whether in towns or villages. Hence the bishops of the early churches, says Fuller, were too thickly planted "to grow great;" and, "in that age, bishops had their sees in poor and contemptible villages!"—*King's Inquiry*, p. 13—34; *Fuller's Holy War*, p. 45, 46.

deny that one such is not always sufficient for some churches, especially where the assembly is so good that every day the word of God is to be preached, it cannot be denied that there may and ought to be more bishops than one in one church.

"That this was the institution of God, appears from the practice of the churches in the apostles' times: at Philippi, where St. Paul expressly salutes *divers bishops;* at Ephesus, from whence certain *bishops* sent for came to Miletum; and in the church of Tessalonica there were *divers presidents,* the same, by the doctor's divinity, as bishops. And as this was the state of those churches, so it is likely to have been in others of great resort to hear the word of God, and ability to entertain a more plentiful ministry. By all which it may appear how the doctor is abused in saying it cannot be showed from Christ's time that there ever were two bishops in one church."*

5. *Ecclesiastical Persons in Civil Offices.*

The doctor unhesitatingly affirms that civil authority was committed to ecclesiastical persons; and that it was no hinderance, but a help, to their ecclesiastical functions. He denied that this was an assumption of another man's vocation, but dutifully exercising the office conferred upon them by the prince, and which assisted them in their own particular calling. "An ecclesiastical pastor must use that discipline which is appointed him by the magistrate and orders of that church whereof he is minister, be it civil or ecclesiastical: so that if the kind of discipline used in that church be civil, then doth he govern by civil discipline; and the argument is good, neither will you, when you are best awake, be able to answer it.

"It is evident that the apostles, from the ascension of Christ, executed both the office of their apostleship and the office of deacons; whereby it is manifest that these offices may sometimes meet in the same persons. Mr. Calvin upon Acts vi. says, 'They did not altogether cast off this care for the poor; but they sought an easing thereof, that they might be attentive to their office.' If you compare the state of the church before the time of Christian kings with the state of it under Christian kings, you make an

* Cartwright's Second Replie, p. 514—530.

unequal comparison. For how could ecclesiastical persons enjoy any civil function when there was no Christian civil magistrate to commit the same unto them? How could the government of the church be helped by the civil magistrate, when it had no greater enemies than civil magistrates, who sought by all means to suppress and destroy it?

"The example of Peter, in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, shows that it is not against God's word for the minister of the gospel to punish by imprisonment. Peter, being a minister of the gospel, did punish with death, which is much more than to imprison persons; and as Peter did this lawfully by an extraordinary power, so may the ministers of the word punish by imprisonment, which is a far less kind of punishment, being lawfully authorized by the civil magistrate, according to the orders of the commonwealth and state of the church. My reason, therefore, is this: Peter punished with temporal punishment, being a minister of the word, and he did nothing repugnant to his vocation; so it is not repugnant to the office of a minister of the word to punish with temporal punishment. Peter punished with death; therefore the minister may punish with imprisonment: I speak of the deed, not of the manner of doing it. I doubt not but that, seeing it was lawful for Peter to kill by a special and extraordinary power, so it may be lawful for the minister of the word to imprison by an usual and ordinary power.

"If you flee to reason, is it not good reason that a bishop should have that office and that authority which may help him in doing his duty, in correcting vice, in procuring peace, in maintaining order, in cutting sects, schisms, and such like? In the accomplishing of all which, he that seeth not how much he is helped by such civil authority as the prince commits unto him is either void of reason or wilfully blind. I may therefore most justly conclude that, forasmuch as the holy Scriptures teach that ecclesiastical persons may meddle with civil offices, the practice of the church confirms the same, and reason tells that it is convenient; and seeing that such as practise them both in the manner and form before declared break not forth into any other man's calling, busy not themselves in things which belong not to them, but walk in their calling, occupy themselves in matters incident to it, and do

good service to God, their prince, and their country, these offices may very aptly concur and meet in one person, and be profitably joined together in one man."*

Mr. Cartwright, addressing the doctor, said, "You imagine the bishops to be men of great burden, that, in addition to their ministry, they are able to carry the civil office. How then cometh it to pass that they commit part of their own office to chancellors, archdeacons, and others, unless they have more to do than they can do themselves? What a confusion is it to turn over to others things which they say properly belong to their office, and to take offices which they confess do not belong to their calling!

"I alleged that the apostles, who possessed greater gifts than can be hoped for from any others, in order to the accomplishment of the ministry of the word, gave over even the disposition of the church-money, a thing merely ecclesiastical, and therefore that which might have been more easily joined with the ministry of the word than a civil office. To this he answers, 'The apostles had both those charges, therefore these offices may sometimes meet in the same person;' where, if he mean they may meet now, it followeth not. Although they might meet before the Holy Ghost made a distinct office of it; yet they might not do so afterward, when it was otherwise determined by the mouth of God. There were divers kind of marriages lawful at the beginning, as brother with sister, aunt with nephew, which, after the Lord had otherwise ordered, were unlawful. The decree of the apostles touching the new office was general for all places, and not only where there were many poor or many thousands of professors. What a boldness is it, when the Scripture plainly shows the cause of delivering themselves from this office to have been that they should not leave their ministry, but be continually in it, and to reject this cause, and set up another to which the Scripture gives no countenance.

"To that which I alleged, even that it is as monstrous for the bishop to go from the pulpit to the place of civil judgment as for my lord mayor to go to the pulpit, he affirms that it is not uncomely to go from the pulpit to the administration of civil justice, which is mere mockery of the reader. Not daring to deny

* Whitgift's Defence, p. 752—774.

that it would be uncomely for the lord mayor, he answers by affirming the thing in question. If he say it is not uncomely for the lord mayor to go into the pulpit, he runs to that which he says, 'I surmise of him, of which I have not a letter.' The truth is that he may as well say the magistrate may minister the sacrament and preach, which is the proper duty of the minister, as say the minister of the word may sit in judgment of civil causes, which is the proper duty of the magistrate. Consider what difference the Lord hath made between the office of the civil magistrate and that of the minister; the same must of necessity be between the office of the minister and that of the magistrate: as it is the same distance from Athens to Thebes, as from Thebes to Athens; or, if it be a mile from the top of the hill to the bottom, it must be the same from the bottom to the top.

"I grant," Mr. Cartwright adds, "that the doctor does not allege all the reasons of the papists; but his reasons are the same as those of the papists. With grief I am compelled to see him carried further beyond the bounds of modesty than they are. They content themselves with saying that their ministry is not *greatly hindered* by being united with civil offices; but he affirms that these offices are a *furtherance* of their ministry. This, however, can hardly be accomplished without a miracle; that a man, having a burden as much as he is able to bear, should manage his affairs so dexterously as to be not only able to bear another almost as heavy, but also to bear it more easily! Calvin, answering the papists, who only say that the exercise of a civil office did not *much hinder* their spiritual ministry, called their answer babbling; so he left the doctor to consider how sharply he would have censured his boldness.

"The doctor wishes the minister to have the sword in his own hand, that, besides the sentence of excommunication, he may strike further into the hearts of the people. This is that fear which the apostle most properly gives to the civil magistrate, because of the sword which he beareth, but is here transferred to ministers; and thus it comes to pass that they, having both civil and ecclesiastical vengeance in their own hands, make themselves more terrible to the people than the magistrate, who has only the civil sword. If this be not in time prevented, the magistrate will

grow in contempt; and other inconveniences, with which princes have been already beaten, ought so much the more strictly to be examined.

"The reasons brought to show that Peter's killing Ananias and Sapphira with the word, which was taken from Piggius, do not prove that ministers may have their prisons. Peter punishing with death, he says, did nothing repugnant to his vocation; therefore it is not repugnant to the vocation of a minister to punish with temporal punishment: which followeth not. The vocation of a minister *now* is not the same as Peter had at that time; not only because he was an *apostle*, but because, without a particular motion of the Spirit of God, it would have been unlawful for even Peter to have done so. To say that which Peter did by *extraordinary* power, the minister may now do by an *ordinary*, would bring all kinds of confusion into the church and commonwealth. As in the case of Phineas, a private man killed, and that of the Israelites borrowing money, which they never meant to restore, if the magistrate will license men to do such things, it will, according to the doctor's rule, be lawful. If he say that those are things forbidden, but not that a minister should bear a civil office, it is only begging the question in dispute, of which he is continually guilty. The doctor cites for witnesses Cranmer, Ridley, and Hooper. But it is manifest that Hooper condemns the practice, and shows 'that the bishops for the space of four hundred years after the apostles, although they were more able than ours, did not meddle with any civil affairs.' Hooper sharply reflected on the bishops who meddled with civil offices, especially when one office was 'more than they were able to discharge, and it was impossible that they should do both.' It is added, 'If the magistrate will employ a bishop in civil affairs, he ought to discharge him of his ministry.' If Cranmer and Ridley exercised both, that is to be ascribed to the time, wherein by the sun of the gospel, lately risen in this kingdom, all the clouds with which popery had overcast our land could not be so suddenly dispersed.

"Seeing, therefore, the minister's office is only in things that pertain to God, which, for their superior excellency, the Holy Ghost contrasts with the affairs of princes and commonwealths; seeing it is of greater weight than the strongest back can bear,

and of wider extent than the longest arms can crasp; seeing it tends to the destruction of the body, when one member encroaches upon the office of another, and that the civil magistrate may by the same right invade the office of the minister as he the office of the civil magistrate; seeing, further, that our Saviour, having the Spirit without measure, refused, as a thing unmeet for His ministry, the office of a judge; seeing also the apostles gave over the office of the deacon as that which they were not able to execute with their ministry, I conclude that it is not lawful for the minister of Christ to bear a civil office."*†

Having furnished the particulars which constitute the marrow of this great controversy, the whole is submitted to the reader's enlightened and unbiassed consideration. From this authentic detail of facts, a disinterested public will decide how large a portion of truth or error was on the one side or the other. It was unnecessary to enumerate the multiplied cavils and objections, and lesser differences; but it was necessary to furnish a condensed view of the formidable debate, avoiding all matters confessedly trivial and unnecessary. The controversy afforded ample opportunity for the display of personal hostility, which was strikingly manifest in Dr. Whitgift; nor could his conduct fail to generate a somewhat similar feeling in the nobler breast of Mr. Cartwright. The daring affirmation, haughty bitterness, unfeeling insolence, and glaring domination of the former, almost necessarily engendered a portion of sharpness and resentment in the writings of the latter. Whitgift, as the reader has doubtless perceived, not unfrequently took for granted that which he had engaged to prove; and he often concludes with a bold affirmation, as if that contained sufficient proof of the point under discussion.

As the views or interests of certain writers were affected, their language is very remarkable. They even venture to affirm that

* Cartwright's Second Replie, part ii. p. 9—31. † Mr. Hooker states, "That sundry eminent canons, bearing the name of apostolical, and divers councils have forbidden the clergy to bear any secular office, and have enjoined them to attend altogether upon reading, preaching, and prayer: whereupon most of the ancient fathers have showed great dislike that these two powers should be united in one person." He also adds, "That ecclesiastical persons were by ancient order forbidden to be executors of any man's testament, or to undertake the wordship of children."—*Hooker's Eccl. Polity*, vol. iii. p. 181, 183.

Mr. Cartwright never attempted to answer Whitgift's "Defence;" but, conscious of being foiled, he left the conqueror master of the field, and possessed of the spoils of absolute victory! Some, it is said, ascribed Mr. Cartwright's silence to his *weakness;* that, having spent "all his powder and shot in former battles," he was forced to quit the field discomfited: but others ascribed it to his *pride,* by undervaluing what he could not overcome, or accounting Whitgift's "Defence" no answer, but a repetition of what was already refuted. Some, it is added, imputed his silence to his *patience,* since multiplied answers would only increase contention, and, while women strive to have the last word, men please themselves with the last *reason;* but others are said to have attributed his silence to the policy of the party, resolving to go a new way to work, and to turn their serious books into satyrical pamphlets; and some ascribed it to Mr. Cartwright's modest respect for his adversary, who was placed on a much higher ground, being soon after preferred to a bishopric, then to the see of Canterbury: so Mr. Cartwright wrote no more, but left the reader to judge which had maintained his cause with most reason and charity! *

It is difficult to find a satisfactory apology for these writers obtruding these comments on occurrences which never existed. No men ever enjoyed better opportunities of obtaining a correct knowledge of the *whole* of this controversy; and no one will doubt their disposition or abilities. If, after all, their mis-statements are to be attributed to their ignorance or inattention, they ought certainly to have been less lavish of their comments and censures; but if it should be ascribed to an incontrollable propensity to suppress or misrepresent facts, or some other of the baser passions, their conduct would have merited severe animadversion.

It was observed by a contemporary that Whitgift had provoked Cartwright to engage in this dispute, that he would carry to his grave the blows which Cartwright gave him, that his books remained unanswered many years, and that Whitgift had been utterly foiled in the great contest. Cartwright, it was said, contented himself with the victory, which his opponent seemed to grant. But Whitgift was asked why he suffered the puritans to rejoice and triumph in his silence? If he could not answer them,

* Heylin's Pres. 275; Fuller, b. ix. p. 103; Walton's Lives, p. 250.

he was asked why he allowed himself to be made an archbishop? Mr. Cartwright, it is added, proved the calling to be unlawful and antichristian; why then did he not stand in his defence? Whitgift was therefore called upon either to answer what the other had published or to give up his archbishopric, and also to be the means of abolishing the *lordship* of all other bishops.*

The biographer cannot be expected to defend every position laid down by Mr. Cartwright. Had he openly maintained the independence of the Christian church, as resting solely on the wisdom and authority of its Founder, he would have claimed the highest gratitude and veneration of mankind. He exhibited with great force the evils resulting from the ecclesiastical supremacy claimed by the state; yet his defective acknowledge of religious liberty was manifest. The victim of protestant intolerance seemed unconscious of the enormity of the principle which placed the church of Christ under the coercive authority of man. By a long-tried experiment, it was found impossible to bring the church of Christ into alliance with the state, without impairing its sacred character, its holy influence, its heavenly purposes. No church established by the force of human law can possess that religious freedom which is the birthright of conscience, because fettered and paralyzed by ecclesiastical edicts; but the gospel, bearing the impress of God, and furnishing his authority, while enforcing perfect religious freedom, is destined to perform that which no earthly power can accomplish, and is sustained by that influence which no earthly power can control. Ecclesiastical legislation, with its penal sanctions, when carried to the utmost extent, can only enforce outward observances, without moving the conscience or touching the heart; but the Saviour's administration, being armed with omnipotence, is effectual in generating sound principle, awakening the conscience, regulating the motives, purifying the affections and conducting men in triumph to immortality and eternal life.

Dr. Whitgift is styled "that great light of the English church who signalized himself as an excellent scholar and divine, and a zealous promoter of the *peace* of the church, by the full answer he gave to the Admonition, and his Defence against Cartwright."†

* Martin's Epistle, p. 2—4, 22. † Strype's Grindal, p. 229.

The doctor's "Defence" had been favoured with the careful inspection of the highest dignitaries in the kingdom, before it was sent to the press, and is represented as a book "that right learnedly and fully vindicated the rites and government of the church of England."* It is added, that his "Answere" and his "Defence" may be justly appealed to as public books of the Church of England, containing her profession and principles; and they are of similar authority respecting its worship and government in opposition to the disciplinarians, as Bishop Jewel's "Apologie" respecting its reformation and doctine in opposition to the papists!† The puritans are, however, fully acquitted of devising plots to enforce their views of church discipline; yet to advance that cause was the object of Mr. Cartwright's publications, who, it is said, professedly aimed at the purity, but indeed at the poverty of the primitive church. Our author says Mr. Cartwright's books were not unlearnedly written, but were more learnedly answered by Dr. Whitgift; and, he adds, that the two disputants obtained their reward, seeing Mr. Cartwright "grew rich," and was "honoured as a patriarch!"‡

The high encomiums on the productions of the doctor's pen will probably be questioned. It is certain, however, that Roman catholics highly commended his publications, and said he showed himself to be of their persuasion. They concluded that he was at least popishly inclined; and they affirmed that there was no great difference between him and Roman catholics. Ballard, a catholic priest of notorious memory, declared, before Sir Francis Knollys, "That he would desire no better books to prove his doctrine of popery than Whitgift's against Cartwright, and his injunctions set forth in her Majesty's name.—That they were taken from the doctrine of the schoolmen.—That if any men among the protestants were worthy to be accounted virtuous, they were those called puritans, because they would not be corrupted with double and treble benefices.—That they lived somewhat virtuously, according to their profession, and were offended with popish ceremonies.—That although the archbishop and bishops acknowledged her Majesty to be supreme governor in causes ecclesiastical, yet they

* Strype's Parker, p. 463.

† Strype's Whitgift, p. 42. ‡ Harrington's Papers, vol. ii. p. 22.

did not keep their courts in her Majesty's name, but by virtue of popish canons.—That their unlawful maintenance of popish ceremonies, and of an unlearned ministry, was their own ambition and avarice; and they increased her Majesty's danger, by their violent suppression of zealous preachers, sound in doctrine, but scrupulous in popish ceremonies!" *

Sir Francis Knollys, promoted by Queen Elizabeth "because he was a honest man," † observed, in a letter to Lord Burghley, that his lordship well knew that Dr. Whitgift had not only raised violent opposition against the improvements introduced into the parliament, but also that, in his book against Mr. Cartwright, he had claimed the superiority of bishops over the rest of the clergy, as "God's own ordinance, to the popish injury of her Majesty's supreme government." Nor was it sufficiently satisfactory, in his opinion, that the doctor merely said he did not then claim this superiority, but that he ought to be required to retract so dangerous an opinion! "Without this retraction," he added, "her Majesty's supreme government, as I think, can neither be salved nor preserved. In my opinion, the faithful duty of English subjects goeth backwards, and the increase of recusants goeth forwards, to the continual danger of her Majesty's safety by the said claim of superiority openly printed, and sometimes openly practised, and by the public urging of submission against the law! I do most humbly beseech your lordship, in the fear of God, according to your great wisdom, that it will please you to have a zealous care of her Majesty's safety, so violently endangered by the pope and the king of Spain, and by their confederates in this dangerous time. For my opinion is that the only way to save her Majesty from this danger is to abate the ambition and covetousness of the bishops, by making them to acknowledge that they have no superiority over the inferior clergy, but from her Majesty's supreme authority granting them that superiority by the statute of the twenty-fifth of King Henry VIII., and the same renewed in the first year of her Majesty. By which statute the bishops are barred from offending her Majesty's royal prerogative, and from offending the laws and customs of the realm." ‡

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. li. art. 18; Strype's Whitgift, p. 266, 303.

† Nare's Burghley, vol. iii. p. 458.

‡ Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 32.

This celebrated statesman further declared to Burghley that Whitgift ought to be called to make an *open recantation.* Jesus Christ, he said, evidently declared that his kingdom was not of this world, therefore he gave no worldly rule or pre-eminence to his apostles, but commanded them to "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." But if Mr. Cartwright would have no government, as he was accused, the bishops "cared for no government but that which was *worldly* and *forcible* over their brethren, which Christ never gave to his apostles."*

It is not necessary to inquire how apostolical successionists would have felt under the lash of this celebrated statesman. He proved from the clearest evidence that all the superiority possessed by the bishops was derived from the queen; and that, if they possessed any peculiar succession, it could not be from the apostles, but from her Majesty, who made them bishops, and could unmake them at pleasure. It was indeed imposible to have an unbroken succession from the apostles, without claiming their descent from "the whore of Babylon, and the mother of harlots!" This supercilious claim had been made by Wolsey, Gardiner, Pole, and the rest of the popish dignitaries, who arrogated to themselves this mysterious superiority, and who, from mere worldly policy, proclaimed their insulting arrogance and domination. The dupes of fanaticism, in imitation of their forefathers, still shroud and entrench themselves under similar opinions, absolutely unauthorized by the word of God. Do they expect men of sober reflection to believe their senseless dogmas? or, do they patronise this imposture to create in the minds of the ignorant a mystical reverence and superstitious admiration of their fancied superiority? The facts detailed concerning Queen Elizabeth's bishops were very humiliating. It may be added, that the bishops have always, with few exceptions, been sufficiently forward to uphold their imagined superiority and secular interest, but have seldom failed to oppose the measures for reforming abuses and diminishing the burdens of the people!

The statements of Sir Francis Knollys were instructive lessons, had the bishops been disposed to learn. Mr. Cartwright and his publications are very meanly rated by certain historians, who

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 389.

declare that folly was bred in his heart, and nothing but the rod of correction could drive it out; that his arguments were too slight to build up, and too weak to pull down; and that they proved to be so as soon as they were examined by his learned opponent! Whitgift was therefore advised not to answer Mr. Cartwright's "Second Replie," but treat it as beneath his attention, and unworthy of his notice.* Sir Francis Knollys formed a very different opinion of the work, and signified to Lord Burghley that Whitgift had "much more audacity than truth in his answer to the writings of the grave and learned Cartwright;" and he found it incomparably more easy to pour contempt on his opponent than to refute his opinions.†

The most famous scholars and divines were summoned to bear witness against Mr. Cartwright, and made to speak in the language of keen censure, especially by one whose ungenerous practice is too much imitated by other writers. Dr. Bancroft represented the famous Dr. Whitaker as having addressed a letter to Whitgift, after he was made archbishop, containing this picture of Mr. Cartwright and his publication: "I have read a great part of that book, the 'Second Replie,' which Cartwright hath lately set forth. I pray God I may not live if ever I saw any thing more loosely and almost more childishly written. It is true that for words he hath great store, and those both fine and new; but for matter, as far as I can judge, he is altogether barren. Moreover, he doth not only think perversely of the authority of princes in causes ecclesiastical, but also flieth into the holds of the papists, from whom he would be thought to dissent with a mortal hatred. But in this point he is not to be endured, and in other parts he borroweth his arguments from the papists. He playeth with words, and is lame in his sentences, and is altogether unworthy to be confuted by any man of learning!"‡

Admitting this letter to be authentic, it contains only the opinion and affirmation of one man, though one of the highest order: but there is some reason to suspect that the epistle is a forgery, devised to blacken the character of our divine; it rests on the slender authority of Bancroft, whose writings are full of bitter-

* Heylin's Pres. p. 272, 274; Chalmers, vol. xxxii. p. 6.

† Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxi. art. 57. ‡ Bancroft's Survey, p. 380.

ness and misrepresentation. It is said to have been written about the time when Dr. Whitaker, in co-operation with other learned divines, solicited Mr. Cartwright to answer the Rhemist translation of the New Testament, to be particularly noticed hereafter; when, in addition to other applause, he united with his brethren in this high commendation: "It is not for every one to be thrust forth into the Lord's battles; but such captains are to be chosen from amongst David's worthies, one of which we acknowledge you to be, by the *former battles* undergone for the walls of our city, the church."

The former battles in which Mr. Cartwright had engaged, and for which he received this high commendation from Dr. Whitaker and others, were his published controversies with Dr. Whitgift. But when those controversies are described by the disingenuous pen of Dr. Bancroft, this celebrated divine is made to speak the language of keen reproach both of Mr. Cartwright and his battles! How are the two occurrences then to be reconciled? It ought also to be recollected that Dr. Whitaker had great intimacy with Mr. Cartwright; that he was an eminent puritan divine; and that he assisted and co-operated in promoting the puritanical discipline; all of which, as derived from unexceptionable authority, has already appeared before the public.* How then was it possible for him to write with so much contempt, not only of Mr. Cartwright and his publication, but also of the sentiments of the puritans in general?

Mr. Cartwright discovered commendable zeal in defending the immunities of the church of God, and was equally opposed to all servile dependence on the traditions of men. The former he considered as pertaining to the kingdom of Christ and the birthright of rational man; but the latter as belonging to the kingdom of antichrist, and infringements on the church of the living God. In his judgment, it made no difference whether those infringements existed in England or at Rome; and he concluded that they were equally antichristian whether under the dictation of a popish or a protestant supremacy. Being jealous of every human obtrusion on Christian churches, he resisted such obtrusion by temperate discussion and legitimate argument, as a duty he owed to God and to the great

* Lives of Puritans, vol. ii. p. 79—82.

cause of the Reformation. He unreservedly declared his sentiments on this important subject, showing his constancy in this sacred cause. As to his opinions, he generously observed that, if any hay or stubble had escaped from him, he would, God willing, bring the first fire to consume it. But if the truth of God, by this arduous trial, obtained any degree of success, he considered the displeasure of man as no sufficient reason for withdrawing his hand from its defence. As the degree of love to God must be measured by affection to his truth, so he could not see how he possessed the least degree of that love if he had refused to defend the truth when it was oppressed and persecuted. In his opinion, it would have betrayed extreme delicacy if he had not cheerfully suffered the loss of ease, or any earthly commodity, for the attainment of that for which he ought to consecrate his life; or if he grudged to live in any part of the world for that cause which demanded every sacrifice of man; or, finally, if he had considered it too much to bear witness with ink and paper to promote that cause for which so many had borne witness with their blood!

He, moreover, observed that it was not the least part of his comfort that, in this vacation from his beloved ministry, the Lord had not suffered him to be altogether idle, but had employed him, if not in planting, which was his principal work, yet in *fencing* about his church, purchased with his most precious blood. He was fully assured that the cause which had brought so much displeasure upon him was sufficient to restore him to favour; of which he had no doubt, if it might be tried before those unto whom it had been unworthily accused. Notwithstanding the opposition of men, he was fully persuaded that heavenly truth, sealed and sanctified by the blood of the Son of God, would triumph in the end. He readily granted that there was greater resistance against this holy truth than against those which were common and merely human; but the great Author of truth, he confidently believed, would defend his own cause against all the oppositions of men.*

In connexion with these generous sentiments, Mr. Cartwright was persuaded that Jesus Christ had furnished all the instructions necessary to promote faith and holiness, peace and salvation, with the ecclesiastical government to be observed to the end of the

* Cartwright's Second Replie, Address.

world; and he might in justice have inquired, Why do men claim that which Jesus Christ has not sanctioned?—appoint ecclesiastical offices which He has not appointed?—prescribe instructions which He has not prescribed?—inculcate doctrines which He has not inculcated?—enforce observances which He has not enforced?—require terms of Christian communion, and of admission into the ministry, which He has not required? These unwise arrangements, as the reader will perceive, defaced the beauty, transformed the character, and subverted the immunities of Christian churches, degrading Christianity and sober reflection.

Mr. Cartwright might indeed have shortened the dispute, by stating the difference between the Church of England and the church of Christ. The former he knew, and often stated, was composed indiscriminately of all classes, professors and profane: the latter consisting of "holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling," who manifest "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." The support of the former was legislative and compulsory: the support of the latter was from the operation of religious principle, and in obedience to Jesus Christ. The former was founded on the legislation of worldly policy, and, as its history shows, was liable to important changes: the latter was founded on the legislation of inspired truth, and will remain unchanged to the end of the world. The laws governing the former were mere human arrangements, and contained in the statutes of the land: those governing the latter were appointed by the wisdom and mercy of the Son of God, and contained in the statute-book of Christian churches. The former church was incumbered with secular patronage, penal sanctions, unscriptural offices, and traditional observances: the latter repudiated all these incumbrances, esteeming the word of God as the only authority in matters of faith and worship. The former church was fettered by ecclesiastical canons, legislative enactments, and the authority of spiritual courts: the latter was absolutely free from all such fetters, and invested with unlimited authority to extend the religion of Jesus Christ. The former church required all its ministers to subscribe the thirty-nine articles, and to declare, *ex animo*, that the Book of Common-prayer contained nothing contrary to the

word of God: the latter presented no such requirements, but urged its ministers to preach "the glorious gospel of the blessed God." The former church, its creeds, and its prayers to Almighty God, were under state control: the latter, having Jesus Christ for its only Lawgiver, repudiated all such control, as unauthorized by the Scriptures, hostile to the birthright of Christians, infringing man's responsibility to his Maker.

From these facts, Mr. Cartwright would have established the conclusion, that the Church of England had *dissented* very far from the church of Jesus Christ! It was not necessary to state whether the scheme of an Established Church was adopted from wrong intentions, or from mistaken opinions; but, if its founders considered the laws of Christianity as defective, or as inapplicable to their circumstances, and resolved to supply an amendment, their scheme, it will appear, exhibited equal inefficiency as if they had attempted to improve the light of the sun by the aid of a dim taper. It ought also to be recollected that the primitive churches received the word of God as the only authority in all matters of doctrine and worship; and they trusted in the ministry of that word, unenforced by human authority, as the instrument of achieving its remarkable conquests. By this instrumentality, says Bishop Newton, "the Christian religion was diffused over the face of the earth, and prevailed not only without the sword, but against the sword—not only without the civil and military powers to support it, but against them all united to oppress it."* Notwithstanding these interesting facts, such is the darkness or perverseness of modern times, that the employment of similar instrumentality, unconnected with the Establishment, would be deemed little better than insanity! Mr. Cartwright was, however, assured that no church on earth was authorized to make additions to the worship of God beyond what was stated in the Scriptures; and that it was the great protestant doctrine that all additions to God's revealed requirements were not only obtrusive and unlawful, but also impeachments of his wisdom and authority. He concluded, therefore, that it was a duty he owed to God, and to his cause, to defend unrestricted freedom of judgment and conscience, of faith and worship. As he maintained the liberty

* Newton on the Prophecies, vol. ii. p. 47.

which Christ gave by charter to his churches, and which all their members are destined to enjoy, so the wise and the good will applaud his moral courage and mental independence.

It is unnecessary to detain the reader by inquiring why Dr. Whitgift declined answering Mr. Cartwright's "Second Replie," yet strong intimation is given that he was grown "weary of the dispute;"* and he had certainly discovered inability to compete with his learned opponent. It is equally obvious that he was not grown unconcerned about the great subject of discussion, but was still as deeply interested in it as ever. His ill success might be the occasion of his growing weary, but his zeal was unabated; and he went another way to work, supplying the deficiency of his pen by the aid of the secular power. He also provided a substitute, incomparably his superior in abilities and amiable manners. Mr. Cartwright's publications exerted so powerful an influence on all ranks of society, that Dr. Whitgift, aware that some vigorous effort was indispensably necessary, appointed the famous Richard Hooker to counteract their influence, who, after many years of hard study, assisted by other learned men, published his celebrated "Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity," fol. 1594, and 1597.†

Mr. Cartwright must have felt himself highly honoured, if not peculiarly flattered, when he found that he was the occasion of this publication; and that his own works contributed the principal materials in the design, and furnished much of the learning which Hooker imbodied in his own publication. Hooker never once names Mr. Cartwright; but invariably cites him by the initials T. C., referring to his books as lib. i., lib. ii., and lib. iii. When this work issued from the press, Mr. Cartwright was not only arrived at a "declining and forgetful age,"‡ but also under prohibition and decrepitude; so he could not be expected to take particular notice of the publication. Mr. Cartwright was called "the hammer of the bishops;" so Mr. Hooker, who directed all the weight of his "Ecclesiastical Polity" against Cartwright and his associates, was denominated "the hammer of the non-

* Walton's Angler, p. 40. † Covel's Defence, Pref.; Wood, vol. i. p. 262.
‡ Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 43.

conformists."* The reader has already witnessed how highly Whitgift's publications were estimated by the Roman catholics. It would seem also that Hooker, in imitation of his predecessor, overshot the mark, and proved more than he intended in favour of the assumption and dogmas of popery. His work was, therefore, highly applauded by learned catholics, who, as a defence of their church, esteemed it the wonder of the age; and, by catholic dignitaries, the work was conveyed to Rome, and introduced to Pope Clement VIII.; and our authorities assure us that the famous "Ecclesiastical Polity" obtained reiterated and extatic commendation from the pontiff.†

* Dyer's Cam. vol. ii. p. 293. † Walton, p. 117—119; Wood, vol. i. p. 262.

CHAPTER VI.

EXILE—RETURN—IMPRISONMENT—RELEASE—ECCLESIASTICAL REFORM.

It will be generally admitted that the Creator endowed man with all the necessary powers of thinking and deciding on all questions in theology, and placed him in a state of personal responsibility to examine and promulgate religious truth. From this responsibility no power on earth can release him. Though placed in this position by his Creator, yet the fact on record is that Queen Elizabeth and her bishops ruled the people with a rod of iron, requiring them, under fearful penalties, to receive their dogmas, and observe their prescriptions, in all matters of faith and worship. These politic rulers, instead of cheerfully bowing to the Saviour's administration, and cordially obeying His high authority, enforced new regulations for the religious government of the people. They, in effect, forbad the people the use of their intellectual faculties, by prohibiting the unlimited exercise of their judgments and consciences, and by erecting a new standard of faith and worship, denouncing heavy temporal penalties against every deviation from what they appointed.

On this principle Queen Elizabeth conducted the Reformation, the perfection of which is so often and so much applauded in modern times. Those who were dissatisfied with the religion provided by the state, who could not in conscience receive the whole and every part of it, but who claimed the liberty of regulating their faith and devotions by the oracles of God, especially if they ventured to make known their religious opinions from the pulpit or the press, were considered by the queen and her sage prelates as enemies to church and state! This erroneous principle had mighty

influence in regulating the affairs of the church. Mr. Cartwright had, indeed, done nothing dishonourable to his character, or in any degree impeaching the soundness of his allegiance to God and her Majesty; yet, for publishing his Reply to Whitgift, he was placed in most perilous circumstances.

He is classed with those blessed and glorious lights who, for their own safety, were forced into a state of banishment from their beloved country.* To avoid the threatening storm, he sought and found an asylum in a foreign land. Though he quietly retired into exile, yet he is represented as having made a desperate assault upon the Established Church; but that he soon stole away secretly from the siege, fearing on his entry, by the force and press of his soldiers, to be surrounded and kept within the walls, with the loss of *life*, or, doubting the violence and outrage of his army, whose fury he could not control, but must have been forced to see his soldiers spoil and burn the holy city, the church, though he vehemently cried to them to save the sanctuary of the Lord!†

The unwary reader would conclude from this author that there existed some formidable plot on the eve of explosion which was intended, by force and violence, to overthrow the Established Church! What were the implements then to be employed in effecting this mighty destruction? The reader ought distinctly to understand that the only warlike implements employed by Mr. Cartwright, and for which he was so severely treated, were his publications against Dr. Whitgift. It would appear, from the statement of this writer, that our puritan reformer, conscious of his perilous position, raised the siege, but not without prospective apprehensions of "the loss of life!" If his life was in actual danger for engaging in this theological discussion, this surely afforded no satisfactory evidence that truth and moderation were on the side of his opponents, nor that error and violence belonged exclusively to the subject of this memoir. If he had just cause to apprehend such danger, instead of censuring him as a coward, or an outcast, sympathy, and charity, and truth will admire his wisdom and circumspection in leaving the field, and retiring quietly to a land of peace.

The reader has been reminded of Mr. Cartwright's banishment,

* Young's Chronicles, p. 436. † Paule's Whitgift, p. 69.

which was protracted upward of eleven years: yet the materials for this part of the narrative are far from being copious; but, scanty as they may seem, they are not unworthy of the reader's attention. Being excluded from legal protection in his native country, he found a secure and comfortable retreat on the continent, and was honoured and esteemed by the most distinguished scholars in Europe, among whom may be mentioned Beza and Junius. The learned foreigners greatly admired and highly valued him for his profound erudition and humble piety, esteeming it no small part of their happiness to hold a friendly correspondence with him till separated by death.* Nor was his reputation confined to foreigners. He was revered and beloved by the British merchants both at Middleburg and Antwerp; at each of which places he was chosen to the exercise of his public ministry. At one or other of these places he devoted a considerable portion of his time in the discharge of pastoral duties, which he performed with equal credit to himself and satisfaction to his flock. Nor were his assiduous labours in vain; but his ministry, accompanied by the blessing of God, proved the means of unspeakable benefit to the people of his charge.†

It will be necessary, in connexion with Mr. Cartwright's residence at Antwerp, to correct one or two mistakes on public record. Certain historians have affirmed that, having retired to the continent, he entirely forsook the Church of England, renounced his episcopal ordination, and was re-ordained by the presbytery at Antwerp; also, that he assisted in the ordination of the learned Mr. Walter Travers, according to the form of Geneva.‡ The former of these imputations is not only unsupported by the least particle of evidence, but also contrary to clearest fact, which Mr. Cartwright offered to prove on oath, as will be noticed in its proper place. And as to the ordination of Mr. Travers, the particulars are now before me, with the honourable testimonial subscribed by the learned continental divines who took part in the public service; but there is not the least intimation that Mr. Cartwright had any share in that solemnity, or that he was even present on the occasion. We nevertheless find that he was pastor to the English congregation at Antwerp at the time of

* Chalmers, vol. viii. p. 326. † Clark, p. 18.

‡ Heylin's Pres. p. 327; Strype's Whitgift, p. 251.

Mr. Travers' ordination, who afterward assisted him in the ministry, which might probably give occasion to the misstatements of these historians.

At this period was published a work, entitled "A Full and Plaine Declaration of Ecclesiasticall Discipline owt off the Word off God, and off the Declininge off the Church off England from the Same," quar. 1574. It was printed the same year in Latin.* Mr. Travers was the author; and it was the production of a foreign press. To this work Mr. Cartwright prefixed an epistle "to the godly reader," in which he styles the work "a notable treasure." He said that he and his brethren so trusted to the goodness of the cause that they could scarcely think it possible that either prince or counsellor would condemn it without being heard. The cause had hitherto been known only by false rumours and unjust imputations; but here it will be derived as from an original fountain. With deep humility, he cast the cause at the feet of her Majesty, and with devout supplication beseeched her, in the name of Jesus Christ, to examine the subject. He acknowledged the author to be "a notable workman, whose breast the Lord had filled with all kinds of treasures." He urged the reader to exercise a mind void of partiality, not interrupted by any error of custom, nor dismayed by the noise and pomp of bishops, nor rush headlong down the stream of prejudice, but direct his mind to obtain the knowledge of the truth. In making allusion to his controversy with Whitgift, he said, "I am sorry that the bishops are displeased with me; yet I rejoice for their cause that, in this treatise, all comparison of persons being separated, they shall have nothing which may offend such minds as are somewhat too dainty." He recommends the reader to "try the weight of every argument, not by the deceitful scales of men, but by the authority of the word of God; to acknowledge the truth once known, keep it in his mind, and bring it into practice, so far as his vocation would suffer."

Mr. Cartwright, in a state of exile, engaged in various important avocations, especially in the care of the churches, showing great solicitude for their purity and prosperity. For the advancement of this object, he was invited to the islands of Jersey and Guernsey, where he remained some time, to the abundant satis-

* Herbert's Ames, vol. iii. p. 1635.

faction of those whom he was called to serve. Great numbers of French protestants, driven from their country by persecution, had settled on those islands, where they enjoyed a considerable portion of religious freedom, and founded churches according to the administration of the gospel. They adopted in general a model of church government somewhat similar to that of the continental protestants; for the exercise of which they obtained the sanction of the lords of the council. Their ministers, freed from rampant English prelacy, were chiefly French; and their views of the organization and discipline of the churches, not confined within the precincts of the chartered towns, spread through the other towns and districts of the several islands. Although both ministers and people were unconformable to the Church of England, yet the governors of the islands respectively encouraged their pious and worthy intentions.

This was the state of things in those islands when Mr. Cartwright was unexpectedly invited, with Mr. Edmund Snape, another persecuted minister, to assist in framing their ecclesiastical discipline. Here our divine was called to a very honourable and responsible service, and for which he was pre-eminently qualified. On these islands, as well as on the continent, he found a calm and secure retreat. Though under the British government, Divine Providence preserved him from the oppressive jurisdiction of the bishops, and placed him beyond the reach of the High-commission.

The two divines having arrived in Guernsey, an assembly of the ministers and elders of Jersey, Guernsey, Sark, and Alderney, was convened at Port St. Pierre, when, the governors being present, a form of discipline was presented, and agreed to be adopted by those islands. This form was confirmed and published the following year, entitled, "The Ecclesiastical Discipline observed and practised by the Churches of Jersey and Guernsey, after the Reformation of the same by the Ministers, Elders, and Deacons of the Isles of Jersey, Guernsey, Sark, and Alderney; confirmed by the Authority, and in the presence of the Governors of the same Isles, in a Synod holden at Guernsey the 28th of June, 1576, and afterward revived by the said Ministers and Elders, and confirmed by the said Governors in a Synod holden in Jersey the 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, and 17th days of October, 1577."*

* Heylin's Pres. p. 277.

The author now cited not only censures Mr. Cartwright and Mr. Snape as the "great ringleaders of the puritan faction," but also accuses them of having "imposed" the order of discipline on the good people of those islands; when the very title of the discipline, as collected from his own pages, clearly refutes his statement, declaring it was adopted by the parties themselves, and formally confirmed by the governors; all of whom, he adds, publicly united when it was adopted.* "This author's deep-rooted animosity against the puritans," says a learned churchman, "hurried him into the opposite extreme, of favouring the catholics."† The two divines, averse to compulsory measures, were invited to afford their advice and instruction, not to *impose;* and, surely, the author cited must have known this. They were men eminently distinguished for erudition and piety; and their reputation was not diminished, but increased, by their visit to those islands.

Mr. Snape, on this important mission, preached at Mountorguil in Jersey; but, the conferences having terminated, he returned to England, and was afterward a great sufferer in the cause of religious freedom. Mr. Cartwright, in addition to the special object of the mission, preached at Castle-cornet in Guernsey; and, on the final organization of the churches, he returned to Antwerp, and resumed the charge of his beloved flock. It is observed that, during the year last mentioned, he entered into the matrimonial state, and married the sister of the celebrated Mr. John Stubbs, whose character and barbarous sufferings have been noticed. Mr. Stubbs, in a letter addressed to Mr. Hicks, dated "Buxton Wells, March 19, 1577," observes, "We have no news here, but that Mr. Cartwright hath married my sister. If it be publicly known with you, and any mislike my act in providing so for my sister, tell him in my behalf that I contented myself to take a husband for her whose livelihood was learning, who would endue his wife with wisdom, and who might leave to his children the rich portion of godliness by Christian, careful education. And if this apology will not defend me, let him not marvail, if I, esteeming these things as precious stones, while he prefers worldly commended things, riches, favour, &c., which I esteem of less worth than a barleycorn."‡

* Heylin's Pres. p. 293, 335. † Lowndes' Manual, vol. ii. p. 922.

‡ Lansdowne MSS. vol. xxv. art. 66.

Mr. Cartwright's marriage to this amiable lady was an auspicious event, followed by the smiles and blessings of God. She approved herself a wise and excellent wife, sharing with him not only in the comforts of the conjugal state, but also in the hardships of exile in a foreign land, and afterward in the tribulations of their native country. Mr. Cartwright, during the years of his exile, did not live in a state of indolence; but, being the patron of industry, he constantly sanctioned and recommended it by his example, and was laborious in private study and in his public ministry, being content with the lot providence had assigned him. Then it was that he wrote and published the "Second Replie" to Dr. Whitgift, and probably some of his other productions; but he experienced multiplied interruptions from sickness and other occurrences over which he had no control.*

While actively employed in these avocations, he doubtless felt extreme sorrow and regret at being so long debarred from the land of his fathers, whence persecution had driven him, and where it still rode triumphant over the necks of the people. It was some alleviation to his mind that he was not forgotten, but highly esteemed and honoured by his brethren at home, who, far separated, were not debarred from holding a friendly correspondence with him. Though most of this correspondence is lost, probably beyond the possibility of recovery, yet one epistle is preserved, which Mr. Cartwright received from his persecuted brethren, dated London, May 25, 1577, wherein they express with pious freedom their zeal and constancy in the cause of ecclesiastical reform.

"We stand resolved that what we have done concerning the ceremonies, the cross in baptism, &c. is most agreeable to the word of God, and the testimony of a good conscience. By the help of God we will labour even in all things, to the utmost of our power, to be found faithful and approved before God and men; and, therefore, we will not betray that truth which it hath pleased God, in his great goodness, to make known unto us. You will know we do nothing *contentiously;* therein we are clear before God and man. But we wish you to understand that the iniquitous times in which we live, and the great trials which we, as well as you, have to endure in the cause of God, and a thousand such afflictions,

* Cartwright's Second Replie, Address.

shall not, the Lord helping us, make us shrink from the maintenance of his truth. The same good opinion we have conceived of you, not doubting that he who hath hitherto made you a glorious witness of truth will still enable you to go forwards in the same course. And yet we think it meet, both on account of our own dulness, and the evil days come upon us, that we should quicken one another in so good a cause. We deal thus with you, whom, both for learning and godliness, we very much love and reverence in the Lord; and we commit you to God, and the word of His grace, which is able, and no doubt will, in due time, further build up both you and us to the glory of His name, and our endless comfort in Christ."*

This epistle is subscribed by nine eminent divines, some of whom endured extreme hardships for a firm adherence to their religious principles; and one of them, Mr. Nicholas Crane, for his pious constancy, died in Newgate, where many others shared the same fate. Mr. Cartwright, beloved at home, was honoured and revered by the reformed churches abroad. His amiable and exemplary deportment, with his zeal and assiduity in the cause of Christ and the best interests of men, gained him confidence among the pious and the learned; so that his reputation was fixed on a basis which could not be moved. While he was employed in pastoral duties at Antwerp, King James of Scotland cast a favourable eye upon him, and invited him into Scotland, offering him a professorship in the university of St. Andrews, which Mr. Cartwright, though a banished exile, declined, but gratefully acknowledged his Majesty's generous offer.†

As already intimated, certain puritan ministers, being dissatisfied with episcopal ordination, went to Antwerp, and were ordained according to the manner of the continental protestants. Of this number was the learned Dudley Fenner, a great sufferer for his conscientious scruples. During his stay at Antwerp, he assisted Mr. Cartwright in preaching to the English congregation. Mr. Fenner about this time prepared for publication his "Sacred Theologie;" to which our divine, after having inspected the manuscript, prefixed an epistolary address "to his most adorned and dearest brother and colleague in the ministry," dated September 3, 1583,

* MS. Register, p. 896. † Cartwright on Ecclesiastes, Ded.

in which, after high commendation of the work, he declared how much he was bound to him, especially "by reason of their joint ministry in the Antwerpian church." The manuscript of this work, with Mr. Cartwright's epistle, is preserved in Williams' Library, Redcross-street, London.

Mr. Cartwright had occupied the pastoral office some years at Antwerp; had laboured in the assiduous discharge of ministerial duties; had directed his capacious mind to the exhibition of the great protestant doctrines, and to the enforcement of practical religion; and God had rendered his ministry eminently useful to his flock: but he was at length induced to think of returning to the land which gave him birth. He had conducted himself with great prudence and moderation; but, for some time, his health had been in a declining state, and he was recommended by learned physicians to try his native air, as the only means of saving his life. His complaint having progressively increased, and his life being in imminent danger, he addressed letters to the lords of the council, to the Earl of Leicester, and to Lord Burghley, soliciting permission to return home. In these letters he said that he trusted the lord treasurer's mind was not so alienated from him as to be unwilling to afford his favourable assistance; and observed that he had lived some years separated from his native country, greatest part of which he had spent in the ministry of the Church of England, though in a foreign land. He must of necessity return for the recovery of his health: but he reminded his lordship that there were those who watched to apprehend him, with a view to cast him into prison; whereas he had laboured to the uttermost while abroad to show himself peaceable. These applications were not without effect. The two lords, Leicester and Burghley, made honourable mention of him and his affecting case in the upper house of parliament, where their sympathy and attention did not stop: they made direct intercession to the queen for his liberty to return; but, by the infusion of prejudice into the royal mind, they were unable to procure her Majesty's consent.*

The venerable exile, placed in these painful circumstances, at length resolved to act on the advice of learned physicians, and return to the land of his fathers, with scarcely any other prospect

* Strype, vol. iii. p. 341; Whitgift, p. 225.

than that of speedily sinking into the grave. After an absence of eleven years, therefore, he returned early in the year 1585; and, in these circumstances, a generous foe would have commiserated his condition, and sought to alleviate his distress. But no! Bishop Aylmer was as incapable of generosity as he was unacquainted with the higher charities which religion inspires;* and, remarkable as it may appear, he had no sooner landed on his native shore than the bishop apprehended him, and cast him into prison! From this distressing occurrence, the reader will perceive how dangerous it was when one class of men claimed the power of tormenting others. May it not be fairly asked, what greater right, in the sight of God, had Bishop Aylmer to imprison Mr. Cartwright than Mr. Cartwright had to imprison Bishop Aylmer? His claiming or possessing the power is no answer to the question. By this rash and barbarous act, which no plea on earth could justify or extenuate, this severe prelate not only betrayed an awful want of sympathy and humanity, but also proclaimed to the world the cruel, persecuting spirit by which he was governed. The infatuated prelate, however, soon found that he had overshot the mark, having committed the afflicted exile by her *Majesty's command* when he had received no command whatever! By this episcopal artifice, he attempted to crush his victim; but he brought the queen's displeasure upon his own head. Placed in this disgraceful dilemma, he addressed the following humiliating letter to Lord Burghley, dated June 22, 1585, imploring his friendly interposition to appease her Majesty's indignation:—

"I find myself to be in some disgrace with her Majesty about Mr. Cartwright, because I sent word to your lordships, by the clerk of the council, that I committed him by her Majesty's commandment. Alas, my lord! in what a *dilemma* I stood: that if I had not showed that warrant, I should have had all your displeasures, which I was not able to bear; and using it for my shield, (being not forbidden by her Majesty,) I am blamed for not taking upon me a matter wherein she herself would not be seen. Well, I leave it to God and your wisdom to consider in what a dangerous place of service I am. But God, whom I serve, and in whose hands are the hearts of princes, as the rivers of waters, can and

* Price's Hist. of Noncon. vol. i. p. 356.

will turn all to the best, and stir up such honourable friends as you are to appease her highness's indignation. In the meantime, my good lord, I will vow myself to you, as my chief patron under God and her Majesty; and surely you shall find me neither undutiful nor unthankful. Thus I humbly take my leave of your good lordship, with my prayer to God for your long and prosperous life, and the continuance of your good inclination towards me, which is much to my comfort."*

Though it does not appear what efforts were made to appease the queen's displeasure, yet this document furnishes sufficient evidence of the disreputable conduct of the writer. Bishop Aylmer, in this humiliating epistle, complains of the "dangerous place" which he occupied. But who made the place dangerous? Was he compelled to persecute his brethren? Was not this odious work his own deliberate choice, as well as suited to his intolerant and savage temper? And what excuse could he have for doing this avowedly by the royal command, when, alas! he had received no command? The protestant reformers had powerfully attacked the pomp of the prelacy, and the proud assumptions of priestly domination, with the errors and superstitions then disseminated; but many of those who obtained ecclesiastical promotion renounced their reform principles, and became persecutors of their brethren. This reverend prelate, in his "Harborowe for Faithful and Trew Subjects," published before his exaltation, addressing the bishops, said, "Come off, you bishops; away with your superfluities; yield up your thousands; be content with hundreds, as they be in other reformed churches, where there are as great learned men as you are. Let your portion be priest-like, and not prince-like; that every parish church may have its preacher, and every city its superintendent, to live honestly, and not pompously; which will never be unless your lands be dispersed and bestowed upon many, which now feedeth and fatteth but one. Could the bishops ruffle in their robes, keep their great horses, and have their thousands yearly, with all the rest of their superfluity, if the queen were not their bulwark, and took not care of them, while they care not for her?" These were the sentiments and wishes of Aylmer when he was a zealous reformer; but, like many others, he changed his principles,

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xlv. art. 44.

with a change of circumstances, and his promotion to a bishopric cured him of censuring the superfluous wealth of bishops. After he was made a bishop, being asked by one of his order why he published the above "brainsick" doctrine, he said, "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away childish things."*

Aylmer, in the above publication, said, "Divines, from the example of Christ, should not give themselves too much the bridle, and too large a scope, to meddle with matters of policy, on which dependeth the welfare or illfare of the realm. If these two offices, I mean ecclesiastical and civil, be so jumbled together, as it may be lawful for both parties to meddle in both functions, there can be no quiet, nor well ordered commonwealth."† This prelate, however, united the two offices in himself. He also depricated the government of Queen Mary as "unnatural, unreasonable, unjust, and unlawful;" but ascribed the highest praise to that of Elizabeth! He had so high an opinion of her Majesty's "ecclesiastical function," that he could not doubt that so learned a lady as Elizabeth, who could direct the dean of her chapel to "keep to his text," was able to make as good a sermon as any of her clergy; and that she was better qualified for the other parts of the service, when she composed a book of prayers for herself, while they were obliged to use one made to their hands. She who claimed supreme authority over all the reverend and right reverend divines in the land, with power to superintend, suspend, and control them in all their ecclesiastical functions; who, by her injunctions, directed the primate himself when to preach, and how to preach; and who licensed and silenced ministers at pleasure, must have been sufficiently qualified and authorized to assume the exercise of the ministerial office, if she chose to avail herself of the holy function! and had she issued her royal recommendation to elect some learned *sister* to a vacant bishopic, Aylmer would doubtless have expressed his unqualified approbation.‡

This right reverend prelate, under extreme mortification, sent another epistle to Lord Burghley, expressing a strong desire to be released from his "official turmoil." "The charge was so port-

* Strype's Aylmer, p. 225—229; Wood, vol. i. p. 611. † Martin's Epitome, p. 36.
‡ M'Crie's Knox, vol. i. 223—226.

able; his old years growing upon him; the beggering of himself; the wearing of his body; the thanklessness of the office; and the continual discouragement, made him wishful to lead a private life!" He added, "You are the man that doth most discourage me; and by your word and countenance, my government is hindered. You say that such and such things are not of the nature of religion, that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction is merely papal, and that you would have the disturbers of it to preach." He then complained bitterly of his lordship's countenancing the persecuted. "It cannot be, my lord, that these words from your mouth, as from her Majesty, shall more embolden them, and hinder our labours, than our toil and moil shall in many years be able to help and salve. These things discourage me, and make me weary. I am oppressed with business—enough for any three men; it must needs make me desperate, as, by my writing, you see I am. I cannot live this life, nor enjoy my state, where I always toil according to custom, yet dwell in suspicion of your good-will."*

The treasurer had already expressed his deep regret at the prevalence of abuses, especially among the higher orders of ecclesiastics; and, addressing Archbishop Whitgift, he said, "He saw such worldliness in many who were otherwise affected before they came to cathedral churches, that he feared the places had altered the men;" adding, "few there be who do better, being made bishops, than they did when preachers. Of late I have perceived that, by your order, poor simple men have been sought by Inquisition to be found offenders, rather than from facts condemned; but I wish that the spirit of gentleness, and not severity, may win them."† His lordship also signified to Bishop Aylmer how exceedingly reprehensible was the conduct of the bishops, and how strangely they had degenerated from their original institution; adding these cutting facts: "Of the common jurisdiction of bishops, chancellors, commissioners, summoners, and such like, I said with grief of mind, that I see therein no true use of what was meant at the first erection of those offices, which I allow well of, but a corrupting of them to private gain, and not to the public benefit and edifying of the church; and it grieveth me to see the pretended

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xxviii. art. 72. † Miscel. MSS. No. 17.

Reformers have occasion ministered to condemn your offices, when they should condemn the mistakes thereof."*

These sharp rebukes, from so high an authority, were peculiarly appropriate and seasonable; yet they were without effect on the callous mind of Bishop Aylmer, who was one of the severest persecutors that ever lived in a protestant country. He treated the worthiest ministers with wanton cruelty, and was seldom sparing in bitter invectives, styling them, "ass, and idiot, and fool!"† He proved, from multiplied facts, that he had very little compassion in his nature; and, without bowels of mercy, he inflicted the severest sentences on the victims of his displeasure, who refused to sacrifice their principles and consciences by succumbing to his intolerance. The bishop openly declared "that he would surely and severely punish them, or lie in the dust for it;" and he recommended the university of Cambridge to expel from that seat of learning all who scrupled conformity; adding, "the folly that is bound up in the heart of a child is to be expelled by the rod of discipline!" Bishop Aylmer might therefore, with truth, complain "that he was hated like a dog, and called the oppressor of the children of God!"‡ This severe prelate made no pretension to apostolical succession; but he conducted the affairs of the church as if he had claimed succession from the *persecutors* of the apostles.

Our forefathers in the days of Elizabeth mourned and wept when they beheld their religious obligations thwarted and suppressed. They were treated as living machines under the resistless power of mortals; while their principles and intentions, their judgments and consciences, were insulted by aspersion and intolerance. An author in those times defends the perfection and sufficiency of the sacred Scriptures. The volumes of holy writ, says he, are come to us in such absolute perfection that there is nothing wanting, nothing superfluous. Though he says, "what Christ hath commanded must be kept till the world's end;" yet "somewhat may be added, as the church shall judge it expedient." This writer omitted to furnish information on two important points:

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. civ. art. 17. † MS. Regis. p. 798; Parte of Regis. p. 383.
‡ Lansdowne MSS. vol. xxxiii. art. 24; Strype's Aylmer, p. 64—161.

Whether the church observed the Saviour's command in the treatment of the puritans, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them;" also whether the church might add all or only a part of the superstitions and cruelties of the Romish church. He further affirms that "the Church hath authority to establish that for order at one time, which at another time it may abolish, and in both do well;" also "that which the church by her ecclesiastical authority shall probably think and define to be true or good must in congruity of reason overrule all inferior judgments whatsoever."* The author was aware that this constituted the strength of his system. But he omitted not only to inform the reader what he meant by "the church," but also to state how far the church might extend its authority, and where, as well as by whom, its power might be stayed. He must have known that the church, as by law established, was absolutely crippled, and could do nothing, but only as dictated to, and acted upon, by the power of the state. What then becomes of its authority to "overrule all inferior judgments whatsoever?"

The page of history clearly shows that, if a man once taste the sweets of ecclesiastical power, his appetite will scarcely ever be satiated; and, while feeding on its dainties, he will naturally and hungrily desire its higher luxuries. It will be admitted that men in all ages have claimed this power, not excepting those who have made high professions of lenity and piety; but the lofty claim, by whomsoever it is made, betrays arrogance and self-exaltation, while it demands submission and prostration to spiritual despotism. Those who claim ecclesiastical power, whatever may be their pretensions, claim the right or power to persecute; they are, therefore, absolutely unfit to be invested with such power. Bishop Aylmer doubtless had forgotten the honourable principle which he had defended in the work already noticed, when he observed that they who ruled the laws were tyrants; and said, "that city is at the pit's brink wherein the magistrate ruleth the laws, and not the laws the magistrate!" †

Multitudes of the best and most laborious preachers were prosecuted, and suspended or deprived of their ministry. Sixty-four were suspended in Norfolk, sixty in Suffolk, thirty in Sussex, thirty-eight

* Hooker's Polity, vol. i. p. 131, 254; ii. 22, 23. † M'Crie's Knox, vol. i. p. 420.

in Essex, twenty in Kent, and twenty-one in Lincolnshire; also great numbers in London and different parts of the country. While suffering these extremities, there was great scarcity of preachers in all parts of England; and, while multitudes were pluralists and nonresidents, there were only two thousand preaching ministers to supply nearly ten thousand parishes!*

This was the state of the church when the gentlemen of Suffolk presented a supplication to the lords of the council, in which they said, "The painful pastors and ministers of the word, by whose malice we know not, are marshalled with the worst of malefactors, presented, indicted, arraigned, and condemned for matters, as we presume, of very slender moment. Some for leaving the holidays unbidden; some for singing the psalm, *nunc demitis,* in the morning; some for turning the question in baptism from the infants to the godfathers, which is but *you* for *thou;* some for leaving out the cross in baptism; some for leaving out the ring in marriage, whereunto neither the law nor the law-makers, in our judgment, had any regard, but meant, indeed, to bridle the enemy; yet, how pitiful to see the back of the law turned to the adversary, and the edge with all its sharpness laid upon the true-hearted subject."

The lords of the council, having received this application, addressed a letter to the judges of assize, stating that "divers good ministers, and other religious persons," had been indicted "for not using the surplice, resorting to sermons in other parishes for want at home, leaving out some collect on the days of preaching, or using private prayer in their own houses." The accusations had been made by ignorant or ill-disposed informers, who could not brook the gospel nor endure plain preachers, who, by laying open their faults, would draw them to a holy life. They therefore earnestly desired the judges, at every sitting in their circuits, to sift and examine the character of informers touching religion; and, if they found them molesting good men, not to arraign them with rogues, felons, and papists, but as men who, making conscience of these ceremonies, diligently and soundly preach the gospel, testify obedience to her Majesty, and maintain the peace of society. Hereby the country will learn at the assizes better to reverence the gospel, and to love the ministers and professors of religion.†

* MS. Regis. p. 206, 437, 513.

† Lansdowne MSS. vol. cix. art. 10.

This state of things filled all good men with the deepest alarm; and Sir Francis Knollys, anxious to provide a remedy for these grievances, recommended a project of securing the protestant religion, by checking the power of the bishops. He forcibly urged that there might be placed in all parishes ministers who sought the welfare of souls—that those ministers whose lives were offensive might be removed—that the people might be diligently catechised—that no Christian be required to support those who maintained error, or those who supplied their places—and that all books impugning the religion of Jesus Christ might be speedily answered. But he stated the point of special consideration, that bishops and archbishops usurped to themselves the judgment of ecclesiastical causes, and punished supposed offenders without examination, whether their offences were wilfully committed, or they had from just cause omitted certain observances; and, on the contrary, he firmly maintained, as of the highest moment, that the judges of the land, in open assize, and on due hearing of the cause, was the only competent authority to decide whether the statute for the observance of orders and ceremonies was or was not violated.*

When Archbishop Grindal was in danger of being deposed, Sir Francis, the patron of piety and humanity, said, "If her Majesty would be safe, she must comfort the hearts of her most faithful subjects, even for conscience sake. But if the Archbishop of Canterbury shall be deprived, then up starts the pride and practice of the papists, and down declines the comfort and strength of her Majesty's safety. The Lord bless her Majesty: but I am more fit to die in a private life than to live a courtier, unless a preventing heart may enter into her Majesty betimes!"†

This noble-minded courtier, in a letter to Lord Burghley, declared "that covetous ambition in church government had always despised the humble and base style of Christ's doctrine and government. The church government in all times, stuffed with the ambition of wordly rule, could never endure the humility of Christ's heavenly doctrine, nor his heavenly and spiritual rule in the church. If our bishops would follow the church's rule, as no doubt they would, if her Majesty's supreme government was stoutly

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xcvii. art. 16. † Wright's Elizabeth, vol. ii. p. 76.

maintained, then they would be contented to forbear their claimed superiority of government in the church, which Christ condemned in the apostles; and they would be satisfied with that equality which Christ left to his church. Their claimed superiority, and their unlawful using of subscription, doth show their ambition and coveteousness. This claimed superiority is the foundation of all popery, and the overthrow of the supreme government of princes. Jesus Christ himself denied to have any such superiority, because his kingly government in this world was not over the bodies, but over the souls of such as believed his heavenly doctrine; and he forbad superiority among his apostles."*†

Sir Francis, with the deepest sympathy for the suffering ministers, addressed a most pointed letter to Archbishop Whitgift. His object, as he declared, was to prevent the increase of popery, to promote the safety of the queen's person, and to preserve the protestant reformation against subtil Jesuits and Roman traitors; after which he added, "Your grace's wisdom and learning doth well know that, by natural corruption, we, her Majesty's subjects, are in general headily given to superstition and idolatry; which are the arms of the pope, to draw us into his pompous, glittering kingdom of strong delusions; who, on his throne of majesty, looks disdainfully upon the despised flock of Christ, that would not be marked in their forehead, nor drink of the cup of that Whore of Babylon filled with all abominations. Since this mighty enemy of God, and of her Majesty, so full of treasonable practices, cannot be withstood, but by opening the mouths of preachers, zealous

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxi. art. 54, 66, 67. † The learned John Hales was desirous that religion might be freed from whatever did not belong to it, and reduced to its primitive simplicity. He fearlessly stated his opinion that the prelacy had ever disturbed the peace of the church! "Episcopal ambition," said he, "concerning supremacy of bishops, one claiming superiority over another, as it hath been from time to time a great trespasser against the church's peace, so it is now the final ruin of it. This is founded in a vice contrary to all Christian humility, without which no man shall see his Saviour. They abuse themselves and others who would persuade us that bishops, by Christ's institution, have any superiority over other men, further than agreed upon among Christians. We have believed Him who told us that in Jesus Christ there is neither high nor low, and that in giving honour every man should be ready to prefer another before himself, which most certainly cuts off all claim of superiority. Wherefore this abuse of Christianity—to make it lackey to ambition is a vice for which I have no extraordinary name of ignominy; and an ordinary I will not give it, lest you should take so transcendent a vice to be only trivial!"—*British Biography*, vol. iv. p. 370, 371.

and sound in doctrine, although, as men, they have infirmities, as well in discretion as in difference of judgment concerning matters politic and things indifferent; therefore I again presume, as I have oftentimes done, most humbly to beseech your grace to open the mouths of all zealous preachers who are sound in doctrine, howsoever they refuse to subscribe to any tradition of man not compellable by law."*

We have not been able to ascertain how the venerable prelates relished the foregoing rebuffs from such high authority. Sir Edward Coke said, "If freemen of England might be imprisoned at the will and pleasure of the king, or at his commandment, then were they in a worse case than bondmen and villains." Mr. Cartwright, to satiate the persecuting prelate, was imprisoned without commandment, and without crime! He was, moreover, sinking under heavy affliction, which was greatly augmented by confinement in prison. He could not be unmindful of these aggravated sufferings; therefore he presented a moving petition to Lord Burghley, earnestly imploring his friendly interference to alleviate his distress. This application was not in vain. By his lordship's tender sympathy and favourable intercession, after having suffered imprisonment several months, he procured his release; for which Mr. Cartwright presented the warmest grateful acknowledgment to his lordship.† Nor did he forget thankfully to remember the honour with which he had mentioned his name in the house of lords, which is said not only to have rescued him from these troubles, but also to have manifested the good reputation of his ministry among all persons in a foreign land. He received his formal release from Archbishop Whitgift, before whom he was convened, when he behaved with so much modesty and respect as greatly softened the heart of his adversary, who, on the promise of his quiet and peaceable behaviour, suffered him, after some time, to leave the prison. For this act of justice, not of favour, Mr. Cartwright testified unfeigned gratitude to Whitgift; and, on the prisoner's release, the Earl of Leicester sent the following letter to the archbishop: —‡

"My good lord,—I most heartily thank you for your favourable

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xliii. art. 9. † Ibid. vol. xlv. art. 77.

‡ Strype's Annals, vol. iii. p. 341; Whitgift, p. 225.

and courteous usage of Mr. Cartwright, who also hath so exceeding kindly taken it, as I assure your grace he cannot speak enough of it. I trust it will do a great deal of good; and he protesteth and professeth to me to take no other course but to the drawing of all men to the unity of the church; and that your grace hath so dealt with him, as no man shall so command him and dispose of him as you shall: and he means to let his opinion be publicly known even in the pulpit, if your grace so permit him, what he himself would and all others should do for obedience to the laws established; and if any little scruple be, it is not great, but easy to be reformed by your grace, whom I do most heartily entreat to continue your favour and countenance towards him, with such access sometimes as your leisure may permit; for I perceive he doth much desire and crave it."*

The archbishop, having received this epistle from the noble earl, replied, "Mr. Cartwright shall be welcome to me at all times; and, using himself quietly as becometh him, and I hope he will, he shall find me willing to do him any good. But to grant him, as yet, any license to *preach*, without longer trial, I cannot, especially seeing he protests himself to be of the same mind he was at the writing of his book, for the matter thereof, though not the manner. Myself also, I thank God, not altered in any point by me set down to the contrary; and knowing many things to be very dangerous. Wherefore, nothwithstanding I am content and ready to be at peace with him, so long as he liveth peaceably; yet my conscience and duty forbids me to give him any further public approbation, until I be better persuaded of his conformity. And so being bold to my accustomed plainness with your lordship, I commit you to the tuition of Almighty God, this seventeenth of July, 1585."†

Mr. Cartwright having obtained release from prison, Archbishop Whitgift was willing to be at peace with him; but, until he recanted his principles, and his grace could be persuaded of his conformity, he could not in *conscience* grant him a license to preach! The reader will ask, What had the archbishop's *conscience* to do with licensing Mr. Cartwright to preach? His grace must have forgotten the arrangements of Heaven so strikingly unfolded in the gospel, especially when the Lord Jesus commanded his ministers

* Miscel. MSS No. 17; Fuller, b. ix. p. 177. † Miscel. MSS. No. 17.

to "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," and when, in obedience to His high authority, they "went every where preaching the word;" and this they did, without the license of men in power. But when the archbishop superseded these holy arrangements, and substituted the scheme of licensing and silencing the ministers of Christ, whatever might be his pretensions, he obviously encroached on the province of God, set at naught the command of Christ, discarded the example of the apostles, and endangered the eternal interests of the people! He ought to have known that the union of pastor and people was too sacred to be dissolved, or even molested, by the power of man. The anti-protestant measure might have made England blush, when protestant prelates claimed and exercised the power of thrusting those out of the ministry whom God had placed in that sacred office! If Jesus Christ had determined that nothing should be preached without the approbation and license of some venerable personage, Bishop Jewel asked, "What had become of the Christian faith? or who had ever heard any thing of the gospel?" And even Hooker admits "that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination without a bishop."* What, therefore, could be more preposterous than the archbishop assuming the power of licensing Mr. Cartwright to perform a duty he owed to God? And, was it possible that the system could be right, which authorized and stimulated this oppressive, insulting wrong?

Notwithstanding Mr. Cartwright's high reputation at home and abroad, and the eminent usefulness of his public ministry, the church of God was for a time deprived of his valuable services; and he was deprived of the birthright given him by his Creator, for refusing to degrade his judgment and insult his conscience, by a renounciation of what he believed to be the truth of God. And he was treated thus, while multitudes, who could not preach, were pluralists, nonresidents, and raised to high promotion, merely because they were ceremonially conformable to the Established Church!

Our persecuted divine had many worthy friends and patrons, who did not forsake him in this season of adversity; among whom

* Hooker's Eccl. Polity, vol. iii. p. 168.

were the Earls of Leicester, Warwick, Bedford, and Huntingdon, Lord Keeper Bacon, Lord Burghley, Sir Francis Knollys, and Sir Francis Walsingham. Under multiplied sufferings, he enjoyed the sympathy and kindness of these distinguished persons, who frequently exerted themselves to promote his comfort. This high patronage was not confined to Mr. Cartwright, but extended to his brethren, and the cause they espoused. The fact is recorded by a decided opponent that, not only in the parliaments of Elizabeth, but also in her cabinet, at least for the first thirty years of her reign, there existed a very strong bias in favour of the puritans. Having mentioned Knollys, Mildmay, and Leicester, he adds, that even Burghley and Walsingham, it is well known, were continually finding themselves at issue with the archbishop of the day concerning the degree of encouragement due to the Reformers. So that, as far as the government was concerned, nothing but the power of her Majesty, supporting Archbishop Parker, then Whitgift, prevented the adoption of the new model proposed by the puritan Reformers, at least in those particulars which did not palpably intrude on royal authority.* The Earl of Leicester was the untiring friend of Mr. Cartwright and other puritans; and his lordship, having founded an asylum or hospital at Warwick, in the year 1585, appointed our learned puritan the first master on the foundation. Mr. Cartwright's introduction to the hospital constituted a very prominent and interesting feature in his history; and the happiest portion of his domestic life was probably spent at Warwick. For several years, he found this a peaceful residence and a settled home, where his labours and his usefulness shone with distinguished brightness. Some account of the institution, it may be presumed, will not be unacceptable to the reader.

The Leicester hospital was founded for the reception of twelve indigent men, called brethren, together with a master, who was appointed by the statutes to be "an ordinary preacher of God's word, and of good life and conversation;" and a preference to be made of the vicar of St. Mary's, Warwick, if he choose to accept the office. The master was required to take the oath of supremacy; and that he would observe all ordinances and rules of the founder "not contrary to the law of God or the laws of the

* Hallam, vol. i. p. 196; Soames' Elizabeth, p. 366.

realm;" and also an oath for the correct and just government of the house, disclaiming all bribery and improper reward. The appointment of the master and of the brethren was vested in the heir-general of the noble founder; and, in filling up the vacancies as they occurred, natives or inhabitants, for at least five years, of Warwickshire or Gloucestershire alone were eligible; and the priority of choice to fall on persons in these places, taken in the following order: Warwick, Kenilworth, Stratford-on-Avon, Wotton-under-Edge, and Arlingham. In all cases, preference was required to be given to soldiers "disabled and decayed in the service of their country." Every candidate was to be in such circumstances of indigence as not to possess more than five pounds a-year, and produce a written testimonial of his character from the ministers and churchwardens of the parish where he last resided. The brethren were required to wear a blue gown, with the crest of a bear and ragged staff fastened to the left sleeve; and without this badge of distinction they were forbidden to appear in public.

The Bishop of Worcester, the Recorder of Warwick, and the Recorder of Coventry are trustees of the estates belonging to the institution. The statute also ordains and appoints the Bishop, the Dean, and the Archdeacon of Worcester for the time being, or any two of them, as visitors of the hospital at any time they please, yet not oftener than once in three years, "to correct, reform, and punish all abuses and offences committed by the master, brethren, or any of them, and to see that the ordinances be in all points duly executed."* The land with which the hospital is endowed, was originally valued at 200*l.* per annum; but, owing to the augmentation of its value, the clear annual income of late years has fallen little short of 2000*l.*, by which each of the brethren, after deducting certain expenses, received about 130*l.*, but the master only 50*l.* per annum, according to the prescriptive clause in the deed of endowment. The vicarage of Hampton-in-Arden is in the gift of the brethren, who have usually bestowed it upon the master.†‡

* Deed of Incor.

† Field's Warwick, p. 98. ‡ The above regulations were established by the founder of the hospital, which continued till the year 1813, when, by the application of the heir-general, several important changes were introduced by Act of Parliament. The

The original deed of incorporation appointed "that Thomas Cartwright shall be, during life, master of the hospital, unless upon just and lawful cause he shall be deprived or removed, or shall voluntarily resign or leave the same; and from and after the death, resignation, or deprivation, or other lawful removing of the said Thomas Cartwright," some other suitable person should be appointed in his place.*

Mr. Cartwright, by accepting the mastership of the hospital, sustained the loss of another living superior in value; yet, to prevent a diminution of his income, his noble patron generously granted him, in addition, an annuity of fifty pounds for life.† To the Earl of Leicester, as well as his brother, Ambrose, Earl of Warwick, Mr. Cartwright was pre-eminently indebted for frequent countenance and protection. Under the wing of these distinguished patrons, and receiving so plentifully from their bounty, with a flattering prospect of usefulness, his sorrows and afflictions were soothed and alleviated. Having accepted the presentation, he repaired to his charge at Warwick, and entered upon his official duties with assiduous attention, and with an auspicious prospect of comfort and success. Though at this place he hoped to escape molestation, and find a settled home, yet he had long intervals of absence, occasioned by the severity of the times.

Mr. Cartwright, conscious of his solemn responsibility, consecrated himself to the service of God, and could not relinquish the exercise of his public ministry; and, having entered on the charge of the hospital, he resumed his beloved work, and preached without license, being exempt from prelatical jurisdiction. His stated employment was to pray with the brethren of the hospital twice a-day, to catechise them twice a-week, and to preach at the parish church once on the Lord's-day. He did not, however, confine himself to

new arrangements left the brethren in the undisturbed possession of their large income; but provided, on the admission of every new member, the annual income of 80*l*; and that the surplus should be appropriated, one moiety to the gradual increase of the master's salary, till it amount to 400*l*. per annum; and the other moiety to the formation of a fund for the support of additional members, till the whole should be increased to twenty-two. The property qualification, which was fixed at 5*l*., is now changed to 50*l*. After these important regulations, the act enforces all the original statutes and ordinances of the founder, and declares them all to be in full force, without any alteration whatever.—*Field's Warwick*, p. 100.

* Deed of Incor. † Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 5; Strype's Whitgift, p. 336.

those exercises which were required by his noble patron; but, as a faithful steward of the Lord, he embraced every opportunity of usefulness to his fellow-creatures. He was not a mercenary hireling, nor a loiterer in the vineyard of Christ, but a zealous and faithful labourer, preaching several times every week, in addition to the exercises of the hospital; to which he was stimulated not from any earthly reward, but from a generous and ardent desire to promote the welfare of souls. He preached at St. Mary's church every Saturday afternoon; on which occasions he went through a great part of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes "with singular judgment and profit." *

He is represented as the first minister in the Church of England who commenced the practice of extemporary prayer before sermon; yet, admitting the fact, this will not be considered as disreputable or worthy of censure. It is manifest, however, not only that he did not reject forms of prayer, but that he used them during his ministry at Antwerp and Middleburgh; also at Warwick, besides the constant use of the Lord's prayer, he commonly, though not from a book, used a set form both before and after sermon, when he "applied the principal points of the doctrine then preached." †

He did not confine his whole attention to the ministry of the word; but, being a man of a public spirit, and a thorough Christian patriot, he cherished a deep concern for the general welfare of society, and for the purity and prosperity of the churches. To promote these important objects, he united with many of his ministerial brethren in the generous design of effecting a purer reformation, by endeavouring to introduce a system of ecclesiastical discipline widely differing from the episcopal government, but not less conformable to the oracles of God. Mr. Cartwright and his brethren, to accomplish this laudable object, showed no ordinary degree of disinterestedness and moderation; ‡ and, to bring their combined energies into operation, they formed associations in various parts of the country, and held private meetings for the purpose of friendly consultation and prayer to God. But these religious assemblies, as is usual in such cases, were unjustly stig-

* Clark, p. 19. † Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 49. ‡ Walton's Hooker, p. 180.

matized "seditious conventicles," and their design as a plot to overthrow, by *force*, both church and state!

In these religious associations, which were held at Warwick, Northampton, Cambridge, London, and other places, the worthy divines engaged in friendly discussion, not only concerning existing intolerance, and the abuses in the Book of Common-prayer, but also on the episcopal government and episcopacy itself, which they considered the mere device of man, and unconformable to the holy administration appointed by Jesus Christ. They investigated the claims of archbishops, lord-bishops, archdeacons, and other burdensome officers, with their exorbitant power and authority, as betraying the spirit and principles of antichrist. These ecclesiastical persons filled the principal offices of the church, and were evidently the life and soul of the hierarchy; whereas, in their opinion, neither the one nor the other had any official existence in the churches of Christ. They could not find, by the most diligent search, even their names, much less their offices, ever mentioned in the statute-book of the church of God: therefore, they were forced to the conclusion that their offices had no connexion with Christian churches; and their claiming and exercising ecclesiastical authority appeared to be an assumption, if not an usurpation, of that which belonged to Jesus Christ *alone*.

In these investigations, they professedly paid the most careful and unbiassed attention to inspired truth, which they considered as the only test of faith and practice; consequently the only safe guide pertaining to the worship of God, the government of his churches, and the salvation of souls. The word of God, according to the convictions of their minds, contained an explicit account of the officers belonging to Christian churches, with their spiritual duties, and the laws and maxims by which they were to be regulated; the whole of which was matter of pure revelation, and which they could not but consider as indispensable to the proper organization and government of the churches of Jesus Christ. The principal ecclesiastical officers derived from this source were denominated pastors, elders, and deacons; and their respective duties, with the rules of discipline, were, in their opinion, explicitly laid down in the New Testament. They considered that

Christian churches had authority from Christ to choose their own officers, and to manage their own spiritual affairs; therefore that it was their incumbent duty to appreciate and carry out this sacred principle.

The question is not whether these puritan Reformers were mistaken in the standard of judgment, nor yet in the conclusions they adopted; but men, founding their investigation on these sacred principles, whatever might be the result of their inquiries, were certainly undeserving of severe censure. In their religious assemblies, one of their number was chosen to be the moderator, whose office was to propose subjects for discussion, keep their attention to the object of the meeting, call over the voices, and sum up and announce the decisions of the assembly. The moderator was chosen at every meeting; and in those assemblies Mr. Cartwright, for his distinguished piety and erudition, was usually placed in the president's chair. To conduct the design with greater effect, they had particular and general assemblies, from the former of which delegates were appointed to attend the latter; and, by this means, union of sentiment and co-operation was secured to promote the common interest of the whole. These assemblies recommended making collections for the poor, and for the encouragement of scholars, but especially for ministers silenced by the bishops; also for Scotch ministers then suffering persecution, and for other necessary and useful purposes. The provincial meetings always appointed the next assembly, and sent chosen men, with instructions, to the national assemblies, to meet when the parliament assembled.*

The reader has already observed the zealous but unsuccessful efforts of Dr. Whitgift and other heads of houses to promote a reformation in the university of Cambridge. The house of commons, it ought to be remembered, was "greatly offended with the bishops, as negligent in their offices, and abusing their ecclesiastical jurisdiction." Dr. Whitgift, when made Bishop of Worcester, had favoured and promoted the cause of reform; but when advanced to the province of Canterbury, he pursued another course, and employed the most vigorous efforts to crush the Reformers, whose principles he considered as ruinous to both church and state,

* Heylin's Pres. p. 299; Fuller, b. ix. p. 140.

which he learned from the instructions which he had received from the queen!* How her Majesty made this discovery will doubtless remain a mystery to posterity; but Archbishop Whitgift, instructed by such high authority, could easily foretel these calamities, seeing he was so zealously devoted to her Majesty's views and interests.

Notwithstanding all the instruction which the primate received, and the severe measures which he adopted, the worthy Reformers pressed forwards in the discharge of a duty they owed to God. They discussed numerous important questions pertaining to religion and the birthright of conscience. They disapproved of numerous abuses in the church; as the reading of the Apocrypha in the worship of God, the administration of the Lord's Supper by ministers who could not preach, the use of the cross in baptism, the administration of baptism by women, subscription to Whitgift's three articles, and the power assumed in ecclesiastical government. They matured the book of discipline, and, after long and patient deliberation, concluded to give their signatures to it; and they agreed to recommend it, on all proper occasions, to the approbation of the people. They consulted what were the properest means of engaging her Majesty to approve and establish the proposed discipline, and agreed to present their petitions to those in power. They also appointed certain persons to be present at the meeting of parliament, to furnish their friends in the two houses with information concerning the nature and object of the proposed reformation, and to defend the cause, if it was found necessary.† The book of discipline contained the substance of those alterations and improvements which they wished to see adopted, and was subscribed by Mr. Cartwright and above *five hundred* persons, all divines of good learning and unblemished lives. The puritan Reformers, under the influence of stern, unbending piety, devoutly bowed to the instructions and admonitions of Jesus Christ, rejecting human traditions and other abuses, for which they were treated with no ordinary degree of severity; and the fame of their peculiar sanctity awakened the jealousy of those who despised the practice, or disputed its existence, placing themselves, perhaps unintentionally, among the superstitious or among persecutors.

The prevalent error, especially among the higher order of eccle-

* Peck's Desid. vol. i. p. 102; Strype's Whitgift, p. 290. † Ibid.

siastics, was, that the establishment of episcopacy was essential to the existence of the state, and that its abolition would destroy the civil constitution and overthrow the monarchy! To expose all this absurdity, there was no need to cross the sea and examine the foreign reformed churches; it was only necessary to cross the Tweed, and there behold the glaring fact, long established by the laws of the country. It is an incontrovertible fact, derived from the clearest authentic records, that any of the forms of discipline, episcopal, presbyterian, or congregational, may exist in the churches without at all defiling or altering the government of the state; and we may conclude that all persons would easily behold this, if something did not intercept the view. We do not say whether this is ignorance, bigotry, superstition, exaltation, or secularity; but whatever may be the exciting cause, the delusion answers a very convenient purpose. A modern author, governed by this dangerous error, has disgraced the pages of his work, without securing any advantage to his party, or any credit to himself, by declaring "that the holy discipline, as it was termed, branched out into the forms of a dangerous *confederacy against the government;* and though *religion alone* constituted their plea, yet the result was *perfectly political!*" The puritanic meetings, which were altogether religious, he stigmatizes "this Nile of Insurrection, in casting its waters over the land, seemed to have many a dark source; such secret societies, and such clandestine practices, warranted the alarms of the cabinet of Elizabeth!"*

The book of discipline was translated into English, and printed at Cambridge about the time of its first publication; but the vice-chancellor, having obtained information of it, caused the impression to be seized. The zealous guardian of the university communicated this information to Archbishop Whitgift, who replied, "That ever since they had a printing-press at Cambridge, he feared that this and greater inconveniences would follow. Though the vice-chancellor was a very careful man, and in all respects greatly to be commended, yet he might be succeeded by one of another temper, not so well affected to the church; and that if the chancellor thought fit to continue that privilege to the university, sufficient bonds with heretics ought to be taken by the printer not to print any books

* D'Israeli's Charles I. vol. iii. p. 246, 247.

unless they were allowed by lawful authority: for if restraint be made *here*, and liberty granted *there*, what good can be done?"* The zealous prelate was an inflexible enemy to the liberty of the press, for the suppression of which he laboured with great assiduity and success.†

Mr. Travers, already mentioned, was the principal author of the book of discipline; and it was published with a recommendatory epistle by Mr. Cartwright, which he concluded by observing that, since her Majesty was partial to books in Latin, the work was published in that language. He, moreover, indulged the hope that their cause, with which her Majesty had already obtained some acquaintance by the false rumours of those who dealt unjustly against them, would be more fully derived from their books, as from uncorrupted fountains. He styles the author "a notable workman," whose breast the Lord had filled with all kinds of valuable treasures, and had provided them a Bezaleel to make the vessels and instruments of the Christian tabernacle. He expressed his comfortable hope that the discipline would in due time be established; and added that in this treatise the "discipline showed itself, and came forth openly in the sight of all men." This discipline had already been twice repulsed, and now came the third time to the parliament the same that it was before; but with greater train and ornaments, as became a most beautiful daughter of the noblest King. ‡

These laudable efforts were well understood in the two houses of parliament. The pious Reformers, undismayed with repulses and other obstacles, held friendly communication with members of the first respectability, and presented their supplications to the representative body, when the parliament with great zeal and firmness espoused their cause. The day on which the two houses assembled, the puritans, we are told, had their agents soliciting at the door of the house all the day, and making interest in the evening at the chambers of parliament men; nor would they *have failed of being eased of their burdens, if the queen would have taken the advice of her two houses.* § Three petitions were presented to the commons on one day to restore and secure liberty to faithful ministers, and

* Biog. Brit. vol. vii. p. 4246.
† Strype's Whitgift, p. 223.
‡ Strype, vol. iii. p. 285.
§ Warner, vol. ii. p. 456.

to obtain a supply of able men for the bereaved churches. Dr. Turner reminded the house of a bill and book which he had formerly offered to their consideration, which, in his opinion, tended exclusively to the glory of God, the safety of her Majesty, and the welfare of the nation. He, moreover, requested that it might be adopted by act of parliament, and that ecclesiastical jurisdiction might not extend farther than to heresy and immorality, as condemned in Scripture. The book chiefly related to the qualification and admission of ministers, the restraint of the High-commission, the censure of excommunication, the permission of religious exercises, and the regulation of pluralities and nonresidence, which the commons approved. This had been attempted in the reign of King Edward, when the code, entitled "Reformatia Legum Ecclesiasticarum," was drawn up by Cranmer and his associates; but the premature death of the king superseded its adoption. The work was now published, and said to contain a complete system of ecclesiastical law, which only required the confirmation of parliament; but it met with powerful opposition, because it was not favourable "to the prerogative and the interests of civil courts."* The commons reduced this code to sixteen articles, which they submitted to the consideration of the lords, that they might be jointly exhibited with their humble suit to her Majesty. But the lords, especially the bishops, opposed the design; and Archbishop Whitgift persuaded the queen to be of the same opinion.

On the defeat of this generous attempt, the commons introduced several bills to diminish the exorbitant power of ecclesiastical persons, and to ease the subjects of their intolerable burdens. One of these bills was against pluralities and nonresidence, and in favour of appeals from ecclesiastical courts to a higher tribunal. The bill passed the house without difficulty; but was opposed and lost in the lords, by the influence of the two Archbishops and the Bishop of Winchester.

This episcopal conquest did not intimidate the commons in their attempts to do good. They resumed the debate on the other bills, which were intended to reform the disgraceful power of spiritual courts, and to restrain the unbounded jurisdiction of the prelates.

* Biog. Brit. vol. iv. p. 2460.

Two of the bills without difficulty passed the house, which so alarmed the archbishop that he addressed a letter next morning to the queen informing her of their disobedience to her Majesty's orders! He signified that, notwithstanding the charge which her Majesty had lately given the lower house of parliament not to discuss subjects relating to religion, they had the preceding day passed a bill concerning the ministry! In this communication, he said, "They have also passed a bill giving liberty to marry at all times of the year, contrary to the *old canons* continually observed among us; and containing matter which tends to the slander of the church, as having *hitherto maintained an error!*"*

The reason last mentioned was certainly extraordinary from the pen of one professing the protestant religion, and the former, relating to the constant observance of the old popish canons, was not much better; yet the queen was so enamoured with the recommendation of her metropolitan that she immediately sent a message to the commons, reprimanding them for encroaching on her supremacy, and for doing what she had forbidden; commanding the speaker "to see that no bills concerning reformation in ecclesiastical causes be exhibited, and, if they were exhibited, not to read them!"†

The guardians of the constitution refused tamely to yield their rights and their souls in slavish subjection to female despotism. They stood firm in the cause of reformation, and introduced a bill for this purpose, accompanied with a book of order learnedly drawn up; including a petition, that all laws then in force touching the ecclesiastical government might be abolished, and that this book, which contained another form of worship and ecclesiastical government, might be used instead of the old one. The motion being made for the reading of the book, the speaker said that the queen had already commanded the house not to meddle with such matters! and that her Majesty had promised to take order in these things, which he had no doubt would be to the entire satisfaction of all her subjects; so he advised them to refrain from reading it! To this great opposition was raised; but the house being resolved to hear it read, he rose and said that the reading of it was improper, because it prescribed a new form of administration of

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 176—193. † Warner, vol. ii. p. 458.

sacraments and ecclesiastical ceremonies, to the discredit of the Book of Common-prayer and the whole state; and added that such a measure would rouse her Majesty's indignation against the house! This was found too true; for, though it was not read, the queen sent a message to the speaker demanding both the petition and the book, and sent several members, who had shown their zeal in this cause, prisoners to the Tower! Thus the representative body must neither receive petitions, nor propose alterations, nor speak of the reformation of Queen Elizabeth's church, without incurring royal indignation, and forfeiting their seats in parliament; yea, for this singular offence, they were forced to surrender, not only the written documents of the house, but their own members, that this royal female, contrary to law and justice, might do with them according to her despotic pleasure!* Elizabeth did not confine her sovereign dictation to the house of commons, but she gave religious instruction to the upper house; and, addressing the lords spiritual, threatened to depose them, if they refused to obey her commands, declaring that God had made her "over-ruler" of the church and the clergy; and she reminded the lords spiritual and temporal that they must not speak what they pleased, but only say "ay or no," on those subjects which she laid before them!† The queen's protestantism was political rather than religious.

Nothwithstanding her Majesty's insulting treatment of the two houses, the commons ventured to approach the royal lady by an humble supplication that the reformation of the church might be further promoted; to which her Majesty declared that she was fully resolved, by her princely judgment, in the truth of the reformation, and minded not to change her opinions in matters of religion. Her Majesty further added that she had already considered not only the exceptions against the present reformation, which she denominated frivolous, but also the proposed platform, which she accounted most prejudicial to the religion established, her crown, her government, and her subjects! Her Majesty also considered the petition of the commons to be against her prerogative; adding, "By your consents it hath been confirmed and enacted that full power, authority, jurisdiction, and supremacy in

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 256. † D'Ewes' Journal. p. 328, 460.

ecclesiastical causes, which heretofore the popes usurped and applied to themselves, should be united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm!"*

What favour could the oppressed puritans expect from a princess assuming these exalted notions? The queen determined to suppress what she called the stubbornness of the puritans; and her Majesty presumed, by the word of her mouth, to arrest the thoughts and consciences of her subjects! Elizabeth was sovereign of a double empire. She claimed dominion over the souls as well as over the bodies of the people. Her Majesty's jurisdiction, as her subjects keenly felt, extended not only to the things which belonged to Cæsar, but also to those which belonged to God. Though she claimed so vast a dominion, and treated the puritans with wanton severity, yet her Majesty, addressing the two houses of parliament, said, "She meant to guide them by God's rule!"† Hume, whom no one will suspect of favouring the puritans, declares that the forms and ceremonies still preserved in the English liturgy, as they bore some resemblance to the ancient popish service, tended farther to reconcile the catholics to the established religion; and, as the queen permitted no other mode of worship, and struck out every thing that could be offensive to them in the new liturgy, even those who were addicted to the Romish communion made no scruple of attending the established worship. Elizabeth's love of magnificence, which she affected in every thing, inspired her with an inclination towards the pomp of the catholic religion; and, our author adds, that it was merely in compliance with the prejudices of the party that she gave up either images, or addresses to the saints, or prayers for the dead.‡

In conformity to her Majesty's lofty notions were those of the zealous archbishop, who resolved to plant her anti-protestant dogmas in the university of Cambridge, which was deeply affected with the necessity of ecclesiastical reform. To crush the supposed evil, and bring the university to this princely doctrine, his grace drew up this declaration, which all the collegians were required to subscribe: "That they did unfeignedly acknoweldge and confess that all jurisdiction, privilege, and superiority, which by any

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 260. † D'Ewes, p. 28, 29.

‡ Hume's Hist. vol. v. p. 15, 16; Burnet, vol. ii. p. 376, 379.

spiritual and ecclesiastical power or authority *hath been heretofore* exercised, are united to the imperial crown of England; and that her Majesty hath this power and authority so united to the crown, as well by *God's laws* as by the laws and statutes of this realm!"*

Whether the Church of England had a fair prospect of having protestant popes, and even female popes, may be left with the reader to judge. The extraordinary facts now stated demonstrate, on the one hand, that Queen Elizabeth unequivocally claimed, and Archbishop Whitgift unhesitatingly ascribed to her Majesty, precisely the same power and authority as that which was usurped by antichristian popes; and, on the other, that the reformation sought by Mr. Cartwright and his brethren was not confined to a number of despised ministers, as commonly, but erroneously represented by modern reporters. The necessity of a further reformation of the church was defended with great zeal and courage by the legislative body; and their efforts would probably have triumphed, if they had not been so powerfully borne down by the queen and her favourites. The facts here stated exhibit the mighty struggle, which continued unabated to the close of her Majesty's reign, yet without the least degree of success. The advocates of reform, both in and out of parliament, used every means in their power, by almost innumerable petitions and publications, to procure a greater degree of purity and freedom in the church, endeavouring to allure her Majesty to the adoption of religious improvement; but, to their extreme regret, her Majesty still refused the least alteration of existing abuses, or even the least melioration of ecclesiastical severities. The popular historian, who despised the puritans, rendered that truth and justice to their principles which few opponents have the honour to avow or the disposition to appreciate. Hume said what cannot be too often repeated, "So absolute indeed was the authority of the crown that the precious spark of liberty had been *kindled*, and was *preserved*, by the puritans *alone;* and it was to this sect that the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution!"†

The puritans had, indeed, kindled the precious spark of freedom; yet they had still imperfect views of religious liberty.

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 354. † Hume's Hist. vol. v. chap. 40.

Mr. Cartwright, famous as he was in defence of nonconformity, was not an exception. Had he directed his powerful intellect, profound learning, and extensive knowledge, to defend the independence of Christian churches, he would have rendered more abundant service to the religion of Christ. For this purpose he was fully authorised by the unalterable standard of truth; and his carrying out this principle would have entitled him to the gratitude and veneration of mankind. He sufficiently detected and exposed the abuses retained in the church, and very forcibly stated the evils resulting from the ecclesiastical supremacy being entrusted to the political head; yet, with fearful inconsistency, he admitted the magistrate's authority to enforce religion upon his subjects. The only extenuation to be urged is that Mr. Cartwright's early training in the school of intolerance had familiarized him with its principle and rendered him insensible of its enormity.*

Had the puritans aimed at the emancipation of religion from every species of incumbrance and oppression, and obtained its deliverance from every yoke of domination, they would have prevented grievous persecution, conferred incalculable benefit on the nation, and secured the applause of a discerning posterity. Though the reform of abuses, with the alterations proposed, would have produced signal melioration, yet this would have left the monster-evil untouched, and might only have removed one species of ecclesiastical despotism for the introduction of another, though of a milder character. The conduct of the puritans was already sufficiently offensive to those in power; but what would have been their offence, if they had aimed, as they ought to have aimed, at the entire emancipation of religion from every kind of human fetters, and at the complete restoration of Christian churches to their primitive independence, freed from earthly dictation and human control?

The reiterated clamour against Mr. Cartwright and others was that they held their religious assemblies in *private*, contrary to the laws of the land. Had they violated the laws of God, or had it not been their indubitable birthright to assemble in private, the accusation would have been founded in justice and common sense; but, as the case stood, if any evil existed, it was manifestly occasioned by

* Price's Hist. of Noncon. vol. i. p. 254.

the queen's unrighteous requirements, who, contrary to the light of nature and the laws of God, prohibited the ministers of Christ from the private discussion of religious subjects and from employing their peaceable and generous efforts for the advancement of the church of God. If it was a crime to assemble in *private*, because probibited by the laws of Elizabeth, was it not a crime for the primitive Christians to assemble in "dens and caves of the earth?" was it not a crime for the noble protestants so to assemble in the reign of bloody Mary? and would it not be a crime thus to assemble under any other persecution?

The reader has beheld the appalling vassalage of the nation, by suppressing the freedom of the press, and by attempting to annihilate the right of private judgment, the great bulwarks of the happiness of society. The overthrow of these bulwarks had driven Mr. Cartwright from his beloved country, and cast him into prison immediately after his return; but from these painful occurrences he ascertained the true character of the ecclesiastical rulers, and, with grief, beheld how far their proceedings clashed with the tolerant and amiable doctrines of Christianity. Having already smarted under resistless power, he used greater caution in future. He made arrangements for publishing one of his books, probably a new edition of one of his Replies to Whitgift; but, the press being closed against all such productions, he was under the necessity of proceeding with the utmost possible circumspection. During these arrangements, he held correspondence with many persons favourable to the design, from whom he received strong assurances of kindness, with handsome donations towards the expense. Among those who espoused the cause, who patronized the publication, and who sent him pecuniary assistance, was the excellent Earl of Bedford, whose repeated benevolent acts ought not to be forgotten. On this occasion, Mr. John Brown, chaplain to the Duchess of Suffolk, addressed the following letter to Mr. Cartwright, whom he styles "his very friend and brother in the Lord:"—

"I send my hearty commendations to you, my dear friend, trusting that you are in health, as I and all the rest of our friends are in London, which may the Lord long continue. The cause of my writing to you at this time is to desire you to send me word whether we shall print where you have appointed. For I have found

a place in Southwark, at my brother Bradburne's, where we may do it, if you think good; for the Bishop of Winchester is gone into the country, and, so far as I know, he will not come again until the latter end of May. I was with my lord of Bedford the fourth day of this month, and he thinks it good that it were in Southwark. I have received of him eight pounds for you, and have sent it by this bearer; for which I pray you to let John have some more allowed him for his charges. He told me that he hath had nothing as he sought to have; and I pray you to let me or my brother Penny know where brother Denby shall meet with us. As for my brother Standen, he is kept close, and also my brother Bonhum. Wherefore, I pray you, as I think it best, that you write to my lord of Bedford, and to Mr. Dixe, that they may write for their deliverance. No more to you at this time. The Lord have you in his keeping. From London, this eighth day of April. Your loving friend to command."*

Only ten days after this date Mr. Brown sent another letter to Mr. Cartwright on the same subject, saying, "The cause of my writing to you is to let you understand that I have been with my lord of Bedford and received ten pounds of him. As you write to me, and his honour hath him commended to you, and also my brother Penny, as also brother Martin, they would see you at London: but the Bishop of Winchester will shortly come to London, of which my lord and I have considered that you had better remain where you are, until we hear further, if you think it good; if not, I desire you to send me word the next return of my brother Undertree. Now the Bishop of Winchester is gone, if it were not for him, we might soon come to our purpose. Wherefore I pray you keep it close; in the mean while we will provide all things ready at my brother Bradburne's."†

This friendly epistle was addressed to Mr. Cartwright at Sandwich; and he received another letter, of the same date, from Mr. William Clarke of St. Albans, stating that he sent him eight pounds towards the printing of his book, requesting to be informed when the printing would commence. He also promised to afford assistance; and, having recommended Mr. Cartwright to write to the Earl of Bedford, he wished to know where he could

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 23. † Ibid. art. 26.

meet him on his arrival in London.* Mr. Cartwright also received an epistle from Mr. John Waterman of St. Albans, enclosing five pounds, and offering to contribute a larger sum if it should be wanted; adding, "I pray you write to the Earl of Bedford for brother Standen's deliverance; and send me word where I shall meet you when you come to London."†

What could afford clearer and more convincing evidence of existing oppression than that learned divines should be forced to adopt so much precaution in issuing their religious publications from the press? The popular historian, after applauding the manner in which the church shook off the yoke of papal authority, adds that the fabric of the secular hierarchy was maintained entire. The ancient popish liturgy was preserved, so far as was thought consistent with the new principles. Many ceremonies, become venerable from age and former usage, were retained. The splendour of the Romish worship, though removed, had given place to order and decency. The distinctive habits of the clergy, according to their different ranks, were continued. The new religion, he adds, by mitigating the genius of the ancient superstition, was rendered more compatible with the peace and interests of society; and the ceremonies which had been constantly used by the clergy, and employed in religious service, acquired a veneration in the eyes of the people, appeared sacred in their apprehensions, excited devotion, and contracted a kind of mysterious virtue, which attached their affections to the national and established worship!‡

It is, indeed, the modern fashion not only to extol the perfection of the Established Church, but also to applaud Queen Elizabeth and her bishops for effecting what is so often miscalled a perfect reformation; but whether they and their reformation deserve such applause, the impartial reader will be able to judge. It is readily admitted that protestant England professedly rejected many of the mummeries of the Romish church; but, from the authenticated facts which have been narrated, it cannot be questioned that numerous abuses still remained in the Established Church, showing its great need of reformation. No one who calmly investigates the subject can doubt that the Reformation was not brought to

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 25. † Ibid. art. 24.

‡ Hume's Hist. vol. v. p. 149, 151.

maturity. The work was conducted by the assumption of those in power, who, having the concerns of the church entirely in their own hands, rejected all improvements suggested from every other quarter. This was the unhappy state of the English church, which was constituted not according to the model presented by the apostles, but according to the views and wishes of those in high political stations; by which its great interests were sacrificed, the spirit of intolerance was generated, and the churches of Christ, as well as their ministers, were treated as if they were the exclusive property of the state!

It was, moreover, the great misfortune of the churches that every legitimate attempt to obtain a better state of things was sternly rejected, or severely punished, by those who, from their official stations, ought to have been the leaders of reform, but who claimed and exercised vast power over all the churches in the kingdom. How marvellously slow men have been to understand that the religion of Christ cannot be promulgated by force, and that force degrades its character, subverts its influence, and retards its progress! Throughout this reign, both the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, with honourable exceptions, were impregnated with intolerance. When they forcibly interfered with religion, they committed grievous mistakes, by stepping beyond the boundaries of their province, betraying extreme arrogance, attempting to do what was impossible, assuming the prerogative of Deity. Instead of this assumption of power, they might have corrected their mistakes by recollecting that God having demanded every man's entire obedience to his revealed will was the first principle of Christianity; and that whosoever interfered with man's obedience to inspired truth, whether by legislation, bribery, intimidation, suspension, or imprisonment, interfered alike with man's allegiance to his Maker, and with the prerogative of God!

CHAPTER VII.

REFUTATION OF THE RHEMISH TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

From the commencement of the Reformation the Roman catholics employed vigorous efforts to secure a standing in this country. They endeavoured to thwart and interrupt the progress of the protestant doctrines, and to uphold the papal system; but the government of Elizabeth punished with imprisonment and death great numbers belonging to the Romish communion.* These inflictions were considered partly as retaliations for the barbarities in the reign of Mary, and partly as that which was due to them for conspiracy against her Majesty and the government. It must, however, be acknowledged that some of these measures were opposed to the principles of humanity, subversive of the rights of conscience, and inconsistent of the principles on which the Church of England founded her separation from that of Rome. These unwise measures failed to promote the honour of protestants, as well as the conversion of the catholics, who, with great zeal, secretly propagated their opinions in every corner of the land.

The increase of popery, at which no one had reason to be surprised, was the common cry throughout this reign. The prisons consumed many Romish priests, and old age many more, without having any means of recruiting their numbers, until the catholics devised the means of supplying their necessities, and of filling the vacant places. For this purpose they erected colleges on the continent, in which great numbers of English youth were educated in

* Kennet's Hist. vol. ii. p. 477, 478.

the principles of popery; after which they returned as missionaries to their countrymen. The project was soon found to succeed according to their wishes; and, in a few years, a number of colleges were erected, and numerously replenished with students. These institutions were called seminaries, and those educated in them seminary priests. Though at one time there were not more than *thirty* catholic priests remaining in England, yet the two colleges of Douay and Rome sent over in a few years not less than *three hundred*.*

The students of these institutions, at the time of their admission, took an oath that they were prepared in their hearts, by the assistance of divine grace, in due time to receive holy orders, and to return to England to promote the conversion of their countrymen.† The swarms of missionaries who came from these seminaries, and who were most assiduous in making proselytes to the mother church, awakened the jealousy of the government; and the queen issued a proclamation denouncing punishment on all Jesuits and seminary priests. All persons were expressly forbidden to entertain Jesuitical missionaries, on pain of being favourers of sedition and rebellion; and those whose sons were receiving education in the foreign seminaries were commanded to deliver their names to the ordinary, to recall them within a limited period, and also to notify their return, on pain of her Majesty's displeasure and punishment for contempt!‡

It was a prominent feature in the Reformation, and an invaluable benefit to the church of God, that the Bible was translated into the vernacular tongue, and put into the hands of the people. Till this important era, ever memorable in the history of Britain, the the people remained in a state of awful darkness, under the sovereign domination and pretended infallibility of Rome; but, on the rejection of the papal yoke, they consulted the holy Scriptures in the mother tongue, claimed the privilege of thinking and believing for themselves, obtained the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and enjoyed the blessings of salvation.

The Bible was published in English first in the reign of King Henry VIII., then were multiplied in the days of King Edward

* Fuller, b. ix. p. 84; Oldmixon, vol. i. p. 460. † Ibid. p. 482.
‡ Strype, vol. iii. p. 83.

and Queen Elizabeth. This gave great offence to the Romish church, and to those of her communion, who clearly saw their hidden things of darkness brought to light and exposed to public abhorrence. The catholics, mortified and displeased, made vigorous efforts to uphold their system. Standish, Heskins, and others, published works in defence of popery; but they betrayed strong prejudice, if not inveterate enmity, against the translation of the Bible, and pretended to have discovered numerous inconveniences of having the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. The light of Divine truth having spread in every direction, the Romanists, at length, found it impossible to keep the word of God from the people; therefore they resolved, frightfully mischievous as it was, to issue an English translation of their own, and even confessed that the protestants had forced them to adopt this expedient!

To accomplish their purpose, men the most distinguished for learning and abilities were engaged in the undertaking. The chief agent in procuring this translation was Dr. William Alan, a zealous advocate of popery, and afterward cardinal; and, though he was not personally concerned in its execution, yet the work was undertaken in compliance with his counsels and directions. The principal coadjutors in the translation were Gregory Martin, Richard Bristow, and Thomas Worthington; and the work was published with this title: "The New Testament of Jesus Christ, translated faithfully into English," quar. 1582. This translation is published in the "English Hexapla," quar. 1841. The translation, accompanied with numerous annotations, was from the Latin Vulgate, the authority of which was strongly disputed between protestants and catholics; the former depreciating its authority, the latter extolling it as if it surpassed in authority the original Greek. The principal object of the Rhemish translators was not only to circulate their doctrines through the country, but also to depreciate as much as possible the English translations; and it strongly recommended that those portions should be especially committed to memory "which made most against heretics." The Rhemists declared, in their preface, that they did not publish this translation from the erroneous opinion that it was necessary the holy Scriptures should be in the mother tongue, or that God had appointed them to be read by all, or that every one was capable of understanding them,

or that they were not often, through malice or infirmity, pernicious and very hurtful, or that they deemed it more convenient in itself, or more agreeable to God's word and honour, or for the edification of the faithful, to have them translated into the vulgar tongues; but from the special consideration of the state of their country, in which various things were then necessary and profitable, which in the peace of the church were neither requisite nor even tolerable!

The Rhemish translators found great fault with all the protestant versions, as containing partial and false translations, and wilful and heretical corruptions, according to "erroneous men's fancies;" but this translation was intended as a substitute, and to put away those which they called "impure versions." They translated from the Latin Vulgate, because, they said, that was the most ancient, was corrected by St. Jerome, commended by St. Austin, and used by the fathers; the Council of Trent had declared it to be authentic;* and it was the gravest and sincerest, of greatest majesty and the least partiality. They declared that they had used their best endeavour, with prayer, and much fear and trembling, lest they should err in so sacred and divine a work; that they had done it with all faith, diligence, and sincerity; and that they had used no partiality to the disadvantage of their adversaries, nor with any more license than was sufferable in translating the holy Scriptures. They moreover added that they had kept as near as possible to the text, and to the very words and phrases which by long use were made venerable; though to profane and delicate ears they might seem hard or barbarous. These were high pretensions; but it ought to be distinctly understood that numerous words were left untranslated, and the words penance, host, traditions, woman for wife, and other liberties were taken.

If the reader would see what can be said to evade the force of

* The Council of Trent decreed and ordained that all other translations of the Bible were to be rejected, and the Latin Vulgate *alone* was to be received as authentic. That venerable assembly not only condemned every exposition not agreeing with the Romish church, but also declared that church to be the only judge and interpreter of the Scriptures; and that they permitted no other meaning to be given to Scripture than that which that church allowed. They, nevertheless, maintained the authority of unwritten traditions, while they mixed other books with the canonical Scriptures, and even pronounced all those accursed who did not receive them as canonical books!—*Bullinger's Judgment, Dedication.*

the gospel, the great weapon against Rome, it is of course found in the Translation and Annotations. The translators, we are told, had their minds fully bent upon preserving, untouched, the whole of what they called "catholic verity;" and their minds recoiled from whatever seemed to oppose this. They were fully competent to execute the task, so far as learning and ability were concerned; but it is added that their minds were so deeply imbued with the spirit of hostility to the word of God, that they desired any thing rather than to give, simply and fairly, the rendering of the text. Very few passages, however, show that their rendering was really a dishonest perversion; but, our author adds, very many exhibit a desire of expressing the sense obscurely, or, at least, so as common readers could not without difficulty ascertain their definite meaning.* Fuller, therefore, in his quaint style, calls it "a translation which needed to be translated;" and humorously observes "that the Romanists, seeing they could no longer blindfold their laity from the Scriptures, resolved to fit them with false spectacles, and therefore set forth the Rhemish translation." † When this work was published, it was immediately sent to England, and secretly distributed through the country. It was considered as a work of very dangerous tendency, by diffusing, under very specious professions, the numerous errors and superstitions of popery, and likely to injure the cause of unadulterated Christianity: therefore, in the opinion of the learned, both the Translation and Annotations required to be answered by the ablest pen that could be found; and no man was deemed so well qualified to undertake the laborious task as Mr. Cartwright. The queen made application to the learned Beza of Geneva, soliciting him to undertake the answer: but, notwithstanding his erudition and abilities, he modestly refused, declaring that one of her Majesty's own subjects was far better qualified to defend the protestant cause against the Rhemists; and this person, he said, was Thomas Cartwright.‡

The subject of this memoir did not rush hastily and without consideration on so great an undertaking, which required vast labour and erudition. Notwithstanding his approved sufficiency, and his zeal for the protestant reformation, as opposed to the errors

* English Hexapla, p. 147.

† Fuller, b. ix. p. 171; Worthies, p. 219; Strype, vol. iii. p. 199. ‡ Clark, p. 19.

and oppressions of popery, his modesty and humility kept him back a long time, and would not suffer him to enter upon it until he had received numerous and urgent importunities from others. Several persons of great authority and influence at court pressed him to engage in this honourable service; and no means were unemployed to draw his attention to the subject, and induce him to defend the cause and truth of God.

The undertaking, being closely connected with the protestant interest, obtained the sanction of very high authority, by the solicitations of men of piety and worth, and by encouragements from some of the most celebrated scholars in the kingdom. The two famous courtiers, the Earl of Leicester and Secretary Walsingham, made direct application to him, and warmly pressed him to enter on this important service of the church of God.* The latter, who in this affair, as in most others, was accounted the mouth and hand of the queen, wrote to Mr. Cartwright, when, in addition to his earnest recommendation to engage in the work, he sent him *one hundred pounds* towards the purchase of books and other necessaries, with assurance of such further assistance as might be found necessary. This was in the year 1583, as appeared from Mr. Cartwright's letter to Walsingham, when he gratefully acknowledged having received the money.†

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 253.

† The year in which Sir Francis Walsingham treated Mr. Cartwright with this distinguished courtesy and kindness, he addressed a letter to the Earl of Derby, an imperfect copy of which is still preserved, stating that a person, not named, was "very noisome" in Lancashire; also praying his lordship to commit him to prison, and punish him according to his deserts: and because the name "Cartwright" was written by some unknown hand in the margin of the original letter, this trivial circumstance was employed to reproach the character of our divine! If this frivolous story is not refuted by the very courteous treatment Mr. Cartwright received, it surely is by the fact that he was then an exile in a foreign land. Sir Francis Walsingham, secretary of state to Queen Elizabeth, was "one of the most refined politicians and most penetrating statesmen that ever any age produced." He was a decided enemy to popery, and the unflinching friend and patron of the puritans; but, having spent his days to promote the welfare of the nation, he retired to his country house to prepare for a better world. When his former associates visited him in his retirement, and told him that he was melancholy, he replied, "No, I am not melancholy; I am serious, and it is fit I should be so. Oh! my friends, while we laugh, all things around us are serious. God is serious, who exerciseth patience towards us: Christ is serious, who shed his blood for us: the Holy Spirit is serious, in striving against the obstinacy of our hearts: the holy Scriptures bring to our ears the most serious things in the world: the holy sacraments represent the most serious and awful matters: the whole creation is

These were not the only applications he received. His celebrity as a scholar and a divine spread through the country; and he received pressing and affectionate addresses from the learned ministers of Suffolk, and from those of the city of London, earnestly recommending him to encounter the popish champion; all of which appeared from the letters of the respective parties.* The schools of the prophets were not silent on this occasion: notwithstanding his former severe treatment in the university of Cambridge, there his memory was still revered and honoured by persons of the first distinction. These celebrated scholars, conscious of his ability and sufficiency, presented to him their united solicitation to engage in this controversy; and their affectionate memorial, treating him with great honour and esteem is here inserted:—

"We never would require of you, highly reverend Cartwright, any further endeavour than that which is spent in the public ministry, were it not that the state of our church, and the often incursions of our enemies, vehemently urge us. Since it is not now sufficient for us to build up the temple of the Lord, but we must also with the other hand fight against the frequent armies of heretics, you will not take it ill if we provoke you, as a foster-child of our church, unto the fellowship of this conflict. You are not ignorant with how great force and fury the bands of papists and swarms of Jesuits have flown upon our churches. We have felt whatsoever open hostility, secret stratagems, and privy plottings could effect. There hath wanted no poison of bitterness whereby either the dignity of religion might have been darkened or the fame of every excellent man stained.

"Whereas hitherto we, being every way fortified by the power of the Divine word, have always in the conflicts for religion stoutly enough compelled their forces; they have of late enterprised a new course, whereby they would persuade unskilful men that the Divine Scriptures and heavenly oracles are on their side. For

serious in serving God and us: all that are in heaven and hell are serious: how then can we be gay?" Religion was to him the highest interest of his country, his judgment, and his soul; therefore "it engaged his head, his purse, and his hands." Addressing his friend, Lord Burghley, he said, "We have lived long enough to our country, to our fortunes, and to our sovereign; it is high time that we begin to live to ourselves and to God!"—*Clark*, p. 19; *Peck's Decid*, vol. i. p. 138; *Chalmers*, vol. xxxi. p. 75, 77.

* Fuller, b. ix. p. 171; Cartwright's Test. Address.

what else do they project by the Translation of the New Testament, and their adjoined unsavory and silly Annotations, where, like travelling juglers, they cast mist on most clear things, than to implant a conceit in men's minds that the holy Scriptures are by us foully stained, and that whatsoever is in them truly and soundly expressed, the same most firmly strengthens their opinions, and utterly teareth up ours? What a mass of evils may hence breed is easy for you to conjecture. For, though a few of the most learned see that all things are by them overwhelmed with thick mists and darkness, yet are there manifold snares laid for weak minds, and the wavering in religion beaten upon by divers waves of doubtings.

"With you, therefore, we are earnest, most reverend Cartwright, that you would set yourself against the unhallowed endeavours of mischievous men, either by refuting the whole book, or at least some part thereof. It is not for every man workmanlike to frame God's tabernacle, but for Bazaleel and Aholiab; neither is every one to be rashly thrust forth into the Lord's battles, but such captains are to be chosen from amongst David's worthies. Of which as we acknowledge you to be, by the former battles undergone for the walls of our city, the church, we doubt not, if you will enter into this war, which truly you ought according to the zeal and piety you bear in your country and religion; but that you, fighting for conscience and country, yea even for the very inmost holy place of the temple, will be able to tread under foot the forces of the Jebusites, which set themselves to assault the tower of David.

"Moreover, which marvellously serveth to the sharpening of your courage, you are not now to fight with any brother or fellow of the same religion, which maketh the conflict more faint; but with the most inveterate enemies of the church of Christ, far more cruel than ever was any Philistine or Ammonite. We doubt not but, like the Medianites, they will, at length, deadly wound each other, so soon as they hear only the rattling of your complete armature. You see to what an honourable fight we invite you. Christ's business must be undertaken against Satan's champions. We stir you up to fight the battles of the Lord, where the victory is certain, and the triumph and applause of angels will ensue.

Our prayers shall never be wanting to you. Christ, without doubt, whose cause is defended, will be present with you. The Lord Jesus must increase your courage and strength, and keep you very long in safety for his churches' good. Farewell. Your loving brethren in Christ." *

This document, which shows how highly Mr. Cartwright was esteemed in the university, was subscribed by Dr. Goad, Dr. Whitaker, Dr. Crooke, Dr. Fulke, and others; all principal divines in that seat of learning, and justly classed among the most celebrated scholars of the age. The first was many years provost of King's College; the second was regius professor, and master of St. John's College, and justly famed as the most learned in the popish controversy. Here the reader beholds not only how differently Mr. Cartwright was treated by Secretary Walsingham, compared with that from Dr. Whitgift, but also the high estimation of his learning among some of the most learned men in Europe.

Mr. Cartwright, having received these honourable and pressing solicitations, was, at length, persuaded to enter on the arduous undertaking; and having laboured with commendable diligence, night and day, to effect a completion of the work, after three or four years, when he had proceeded to the Book of Revelation, to the wonder and regret of all sound protestants, and to the amazement of posterity, Archbishop Whitgift, by his own despotic authority, forbade him proceeding any further.† The foregoing facts decisively refuted the slanderous reproaches cast upon Mr. Cartwright by his enemies imputing to him disloyalty, and also falsified their insinuations respecting his comparative want of learning. It may be fearlessly asked, Would Whitgift, had he found leisure, have ventured on such an undertaking? Was there not then a portion of "*envious* opposition" mixed up with this suppression? Whitgift's learning was confined to "bare Latin studies," which the learned Hugh Broughton often objected against him; and he does not appear to have been much skilled in deep points of theology.‡

In the address "to the studious reader," prefixed to Mr. Cartwright's work when published, we are reminded that, under the

* Cartwright's Testament. † Strype's Whitgift, p. 253, 254.
‡ Hooker's Polity, vol. i. p. clxxv.

foregoing auspicious encouragements, the author had undertaken the work, and that no diligence or constancy was wanting in him; yet, through the opposition of his potent adversary, he met with such powerful discouragements and hinderances that he was frequently moved to lay down his pen. This appeared from his letters in 1586, addressed to a privy councillor of great note, in answer to his letter to encourage him, and to ascertain the forwardness of the work. From another letter in 1590, wherein he informed the said earl that, four years before, he had received commandment from the archbishop to desist from the undertaking; yet, from the special solicitations and encouragements which he received both from him and from other honourable personages, he had again taken his pen in hand. Notwithstanding these favourable inducements to perseverance, he received new discouragements from his old adversary, followed by many sufferings; so that he did not live to finish the work according to his original design, nor to revise, so accurately as he intended, all the quotations of ancient writers to which he had referred.

We cannot, however, forbear inquiring, What could his grace of Canterbury mean by this despotic and schismatical prohibition? Was he offended that his opponent had so much honour and respect shown him; and that he had so favourable an opportunity of obtaining a splendid victory, in which all true protestants would rejoice and join the triumph? Was he displeased at seeing his own learning undervalued, while no one desired him to undertake it; or because he considered his authority neglected, since his permission was not solicited? Or, did he account the church of Rome and the Church of England so nearly related and connected that our learned divine could not refute the errors and superstitions of the one without sapping the foundations of the other? What could move his archiepiscopal opposition is difficult to conjecture; but certain it is that, as soon as he understood what Mr. Cartwright was doing, he sternly forbade him proceeding in the work!*

It seems very difficult to conceive how this tyrannical measure fell within his grace's archiepiscopal jurisdiction. What right, or even pretension of right, could he have for troubling himself about

* Fuller, b. ix. p. 171.

that which Mr. Cartwright was writing against Roman catholics in his own private study? When he said to Mr. Cartwright, "You do what you list; go when you list; come when you list; speak when you list, and at your own pleasure: what would you have more?" it was easy to conjecture how galling it was to his lordship that Mr. Cartwright was allowed to employ his pen in refuting the errors of the Romish church; he, therefore, embraced the first opportunity of forbidding him! Who can forbear wondering at the haughty and troublesome humour of this domineering archprelate? Will it be said there was no need of answering the Rhemists? All sound protestants could testify the contrary. If an answer was necessary, why should Mr. Cartwright be forbidden to write it? Was the work too difficult for him? Whosoever might think so, Dr. Whitgift would judge otherwise, who knew too well both his learning and abilities. If he was not to be trusted in this combat, why did not Whitgift undertake the task? If he had little leisure, or less inclination, to write against the Romanists than he had formerly indulged against the puritans, why did he not recommend some learned champion to undertake the work who was better qualified than Mr. Cartwright? The judicious reader will answer these inquiries as may afford the greatest satisfaction. Mr. Cartwright, knowing that the authority of Lambeth was far more formidable than all the arguments of Rheims, meekly obeyed the despotic prohibition, and laid aside the undertaking. Whitgift's administration imbodied the worst propensities of an intolerant state priest, and prominently exhibited that protestant persecution which deserved special reprobation; while its early severity was only an earnest of later atrocities. The archbishop might, therefore, have challenged the annals of popery to have furnished a similar instance of haughty and despotic intolerance! This was usurping a kind of jurisdiction not exceeded by the antichristian pontiff; so Archbishop Whitgift, who claimed and exercised this matchless power, could not be surprised when he was sometimes denominated, "The Pope of Lambeth."

Many persons, it is said, commended the care exercised by Whitgift in not intrusting the defence of the doctrine of the church to the pen of one so much disaffected to its discipline; but many others blamed his jealousy in depriving the church of God of the

learned labours of that man, whose judgment so solidly, and whose affections so zealously refuted the public adversary. "Distasteful passages," says Fuller, "if any such had been found in the book, might have been expunged; while it was a pity such good fruit should have been blasted in the bud, for the sake of any bad leaves there might be about it." *

Agreeably to what this writer has suggested, Mr. Cartwright had already expunged those passages which might appear objectionable, or at all likely to give offence, in order that the work might be printed by the allowance of public authority. But this was unavailing and unsatisfactory to his grace of Canterbury, who had the control of the press. The offensive passages, if there were any, were contained in the preface, and will be recited in the further detail of this controversy. Notwithstanding the carefulness of the author, a modern writer, without evidence, charges the work with "greatly favouring the Geneva discipline!" † The Lord Burghley, a constant patron of learning and learned men, no sooner heard of Whitgift's interruption of Mr. Cartwright than his lordship applied to him for a sight of his preface, with a view to his own satisfaction. Our divine, being always glad to have his opinions examined and sifted by men of ability, rejoiced in this opportunity of submitting his performance to the scrutiny of so great a man; he, therefore, transcribed the preface without delay, and sent it to his lordship, accompanied by a letter, dated Warwick, August 5th, 1590, in which he thus explicitly stated his sentiments:—

That, according to his lordship's good pleasure, as soon as he could transcribe it, and find a proper messenger, he had sent his honour the copy of his answer to the preface of the Rhemists' Testament. There was some small difference between this copy and that which his grace of Canterbury had in his possession; because on reading it over again he had made some little alteration, as he might further do, so long as it remained in his possession. There was nothing relating to matters of discipline then in controversy. He esteemed it a duty to defend the truth when the Jesuits openly rejected it; and he could with a good conscience leave a blank where they had made a blot: yet in the care he had of not provoking others, but of covering existing disagreements, he

* Fuller, b. ix. p. 171. † Nares' Burghley, vol. iii. p. 210.

never noticed any of those points, except when called upon so to do. That he answered those points with as much brevity, and as much in general terms as he was able, without any application to the Established Church or any of its governors. So he acknowledged that he had drawn a rude draught of an argument, even to the Apocalypse, four years before, until he understood from the archbishop that he was to deal no further in it. He did not, however, so much lament the churches' loss of his poor labours, which could not be much enriched by them, as he was grieved that some things put into other people's hand, after they had been in Secretary Walsingham's, had been to the disadvantage of the truth, and in danger of being published to the world in a mangled and imperfect state; which evil he had prevented, partly by his importunate entreaties to have the copies returned, and partly because they could not get the remainder out of his hands.* Mr. Cartwright also wrote to his friend Mr. Hicks, observing that, by his lordship's request, he had sent his answer to the preface of the Rhemish Testament as soon as he could transcribe it, and find a convenient messenger.†

What opinion his lordship formed of the preface, and of Mr. Cartwright's undertaking, does not fully appear; yet there is reason for concluding that the inspection made a favourable impression on his lordship's mind, since he doubtless encouraged Mr. Cartwright to resume his studies. His lordship at the same time wrote a treatise with his own hand, "Concerning the Dangerous State of the Realm, by reason of Priests and Seminaries perverting the Queen's Subjects from their Allegiance and the Religion Established."‡ This celebrated statesman was, no doubt, favourable to our author's generous design, and disposed to sanction him to the utmost of his power; and certain it is that Mr. Cartwright was encouraged to resume the work by one of the lords at court.§

The preface was afterward published separately, with this title, "The Answere to the Preface of the Rhemish Testament," duo. 1602. It was printed at Edinburgh, under the patronage of King James of Scotland, and by the king's printer; but in this little volume the Rhemish preface is not incorporated. Notwithstanding

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 17. † Ibid. art. 18.
‡ Strype's Whitgift, p. 268. § Fuller, b. ix. p. 171.

all the disadvantages under which it was written, Mr. Cartwright's great work was left unfinished and unpublished at his death, to the unspeakable injury of the protestant religion, without reflecting the least degree of honour on Archbishop Whitgift. The work was afterward published with this title, "A Confutation of the Rhemists' Translation, Glosses and Annotations on the New Testament, so farre as they containe Manifest Impieties, Heresies, Idolatries, Superstitions, Profanenesse, Treasons, Slanders, Absurdities, Falsehoods, and other Evills: By occasion whereof the True Sense, Scope and Doctrine of the Scriptures and Human Authors, by them abused, is now given. Written long since by order from the chiefe Instruments of the late Queene and State, and at the special request and encouragement of many godly learned Preachers in England, By that reverend, learned, and judicious divine, Thomas Cartwright, sometime divinity reader at Cambridge," fol. 1618.

This celebrated work is said to have been published privately and without license; but we have ascertained that it was printed abroad. The work was printed at Leyden in Holland, by Mr. William Brewster, the worthy elder of Mr. Robinson's church, who was there engaged in printing several years, but not without annoyance from English intolerance. King James's despotism was sufficiently understood. He not only persecuted his best subjects, and forced many of them into a state of exile, but his impetuosity followed them across the ocean, and he endeavoured to crush them in a foreign land! Of this number was the excellent Mr. Brewster, who, for having printed certain religious publications at Leyden, was sought to be apprehended and punished. Intelligence was, indeed, sent to the English court that his enemies had laid hold of him, which proved to be incorrect; and his Majesty's scouts were fearful of his final escape. Sir Dudley Carleton, addressing Secretary Naunton, said, "I have made good inquiry after William Brewster at Leyden, and am well assured that he is not returned thither; neither is it likely he will, having removed from thence both his family and goods."*

The suppression of freedom of the press, and the exercise of regal despotism at home, furnished sufficient reason why Mr. Cartwright's learned work was printed abroad, and published

* Carleton's Letters, p. 380, 386, 390.

without stating the place or name of the printer. In the days of Elizabeth and the Stuarts, the employment of a foreign press was considered as an author's very heavy offence, and an indellible stigma on the productions of his pen; but those superstitious times have passed away, and men now begin to judge of authors and their works by a standard more rational and just. The press is now open to all persons and opinions not hostile to the peace and stability of society. The investigation of truth, and the means of extending the kingdom of Christ, are now subjects of unreserved discussion.

Mr. Cartwright completed the work to the fifteenth chapter of Revelation, and the remaining chapters were supplied from the notes of Dr. Fulke on the same subject.* The learned production was, however, laid aside many years, till it was in part *mouse-eaten.* Notwithstanding these defects, our author observes that the work is so complete an answer to the Rhemists that they never attempted to return a reply; and that no English champion ever displayed greater valour and success than did Mr. Cartwright in charging and routing the Romish enemy.† This is no common eulogy from the pen of an historian, who could not be supposed to indulge a prepossession in favour of the author.

The publication of Mr. Cartwright's work, since popery was increasing on every hand, would have been most acceptable to all sound protestants; the news of which, it is said, would have been "woful to the papists."‡ This work, when published, greatly extended the author's fame; and while it remained in MS., it was loudly praised by his friends, yet represented by opponents as unprinted because unfit for examination! Dean Sutcliffe, his determined enemy, said, "Quere, of those who make braggs of T. Cartwright's great work against the Rhemists, whether there be not many points therein contrary to all the Fathers, to the faith of the church, and all good divinity? And why, if all be clear with him, he dare not suffer the same to abide the censures of learned men? And, why any should wonder that such things should not be published, considering what dangers follow the printing of heretical and schismatical books?"§ The reader will form his own opinion of these inquiries.

* Lewis' Translations, p. 75.
† Fuller, b. ix. p. 171. x. 3.
‡ Martin's Epistle, p. 36.
§ Soames' Elizabeth, p. 559.

A person eminent for a sound judgment and extensive learning, who examined the work before it went to the press, said, "Mr. Cartwright has dealt so soundly against the papists, that, for answering and refuting the adversaries, that work is sufficient. They are confuted by strange and hitherto unknown reasons, which will ever confound them when they find themselves assailed by such weapons as they never expected."* The reader will judge, from the prohibition of the work, how much injury was done to society and literature, to religion and the protestant interest!

The work, with the long preface, contains upwards of eight hundred pages closely printed in folio, and forms one of the completest pieces ever published on the popish controversy, especially so far as relates to the use of the holy Scriptures, with their translation into the mother tongue. The author accompanies the Rhemists throughout the New Testament; and, as he proceeds, he rectifies their mistakes, exposes their errors, and refutes their sophisms. To the respective books, he prefixed learned preliminary observations, in which he judiciously examines, and successfully refutes, those of the jesuitical predecessor. But the marrow of the controversy is contained in the preface; in which Mr. Cartwright displays learned acuteness, profound erudition, extraordinary abilities, and exemplary piety, triumphantly overthrowing the untrue and dangerous positions of the Romish adversary. While exhibiting these honourable characteristics, he furnishes great store of valuable information, not only on this controversy, but also on almost all subjects relating to the use and advantage of the Scriptures in our own language. His method is unexceptionable, and worthy of the imitation of every controvertist; transcribing the Rhemists' preface entire, and commenting upon every successive paragraph, under three general heads.

1. *Advantage of a Translation of the Scriptures.*

"By the diffusion of divine truth," says Mr. Cartwright, "the Jesuits allowed that which they had formerly condemned, and printed that which they had formerly burned. In the ancient and more pure ages of the church, the Scriptures were translated into all tongues useful to the people. If there were any translation in

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 254.

the later times of popery, it was a close prisoner; it could neither come to the people, nor the people to it; and it was the same whether there were none, or no one allowed to use them. If any were in use, it was manifest by their own confession that their superiors were permitted to wrest them out of the hands of the people; and it was evident that they permitted them, not from a reverence of the Scriptures, nor from love to the people, but as desperate enemies, who had rather kill with them than have their errors cured by them. It fared with them as with men who have a natural hatred of any particular kind of food, the very sight of which offends them; yet, being famished, they are content even to eat it, for the preservation of their lives. Although they had abhorred the Scriptures in time of peace; yet, when involved in difficulties by such as they called *heretics*, they were glad to use the Scriptures, if happily they could get any thing to serve their purpose. Tell us, good sirs, is the reading of the Scriptures by the people, like some kinds of fruit, good only at certain seasons of the year? Is it physic when men are sick, and not food when they are well? Will it drive out poison, and not preserve from it? Hath it strength to put our enemies to flight, and hath it none to hinder their approach? The contrary, surely, is most true.

"If the people's harvest of reading the Scripture be only in foul weather, how came it to pass that, for the space of forty years, when the heretical translations, as they are called, filled the land, they did not procure this translation for the people, whereby they might have obtained so much food as, in this dearth of masses, would have satiated their hunger?" They said it was not necessary for all kinds of persons to read the Scriptures; but Mr. Cartwright maintained it was necessary that all men should use all good means to know Christ more perfectly: but reading the Scriptures, which testified of Him, was a profitable help thereunto; therefore it was necessary. In order to their increasing in the knowledge of Christ by reading, our Lord urged the people to *search the Scriptures;* and exhorted them not only to hear the word *preached*, but to use the other means of *reading*, whereby they might dig out the hidden treasures of divine knowledge. As this proved that the reading of the Scriptures was a good help to

the people, so the example of the worthy Bereans declared it to be necessary for all believers to examine the Scriptures, that they might be confirmed in the faith of Jesus Christ. If it were safe for the Jews, who did not believe in Christ, to read and search the Scriptures, how could it be dangerous for Christians, who had already believed in him and borne testimony of him? And if it were commendable for those who were novices in Christianity, and plants of a day old, to read and search the Scriptures, how much more ought the Scriptures to be committed to those who were initiated into Christianity from their mother's womb?

It was necessary for all men to use all those aids whereby they might know and obey the will of God. The law commanded that every one should not only have the law sounding like a trumpet in his ears, but also that it should be as a ring upon his finger, as a bracelet upon his hand, as a frontlet before his eyes, that it might always be in sight. For the same purpose God commanded that the law should be written upon the frontiers of the land, upon the gates of the city, upon the posts of every man's private house. If it were then thought good in the wisdom of God that the people should read the law graven or painted upon pillars, gates, and doors, where they could not consider it so gravely, how much more was it His good pleasure that they should read the same sitting in their houses, where, with the book before them, they might more deliberately conceive the sense, and receive the fruit of it? When the apostle commanded that the word of Christ should abound among Christians "richly in all wisdom," he certainly required them to cultivate a familiar acquaintance with it. If the reading of the Scriptures was a lawful exercise, and was thus commanded by the apostle, it was a necessary Christian duty. The people were commanded to try the spirits, whether they were of God; but they could never do this without examination by reading and meditation in the word of God. The king, on account of his weighty business, might seem freed from reading in the law of the Lord, and be content with hearing sermons in the temple, was nevertheless commanded to read the book of the law diligently; surely then the common people, who are neither so full of business, nor have the welfare of so many depending upon them, cannot be exempted from this exercise of piety. If it be necessary for the

king to read the word of God, that he may *rule* well, it is necessary that his subjects should do the same, that they may *obey* well. If it be needful for him to read, that he may not command things which are unlawful, there is the same necessity for them to do the same, lest, in the baseness of their minds, they should obey man rather than God.

Under the Jewish dispensation, women and children, noble and ignoble, rich and poor, wise and foolish, exercised themselves in the book of God; and it betrayed great ignorance to take away that privilege which the people then enjoyed, when all persons, in all places, were commanded to talk of the law of the Lord. He readily admitted that, if all men were suffered to examine every thing by the holy Scriptures, their antichristian merchandise of masses and dirges, pardons and indulgences, would soon come to an end. The Scriptures were compared to a sword in the hand of a soldier; but the people might easily perceive that, when their weapons were taken from them, they intended to betray them into the hands of their enemies. "Although certain madmen in the camp may abuse their swords to their own destruction, or the destruction of others, yet the law forbidding them to wear their swords in the field will never be accounted just. Instead of this prohibition, therefore, ought not all soldiers to be commanded to wear their swords? But you have made a proclamation that no soldier, without a special license, shall wear his sword. Does not this show your unskilfulness in the Christian warfare?"

Mr. Cartwright accused the Rhemists of despising the holy Scriptures, as if they were of no further use than merely to keep the people from devoting themselves too much to cards and stage plays. They were better satisfied with the people living in sin than taking the book of God in their hands. Pharaoh's profaneness could not be compared with that of these uncircumcised Jesuits. He kept the people from their religious exercises to promote his own worldly interest; but these enemies of truth were content that the people should be employed in the basest sports and plays to keep them from reading the Scriptures, especially if they did not addict themselves *too much* in them!

"The epistles in the New Testament," observed Mr. Cartwright, "were originally addressed to the people for the express purpose

of their reading them, and laying up the contents in their hearts; why then were they now deprived of them? He acknowledged the wonderful depths of wisdom and grace contained in the word of God; but he did not consider this a sufficient reason for prohibiting men from digging in so rich a mine. Though no man could fully sound the truths of Scripture, yet every one might know those things that were necessary to salvation. Chrysostome said that the people did not understand Paul's epistles; not because they were unlearned, but because they continually rejected them. And Jerome said, 'let the Divine Scriptures be always in thy hands, and let them be incessantly rolled in thy mind.' If all the Scriptures were so difficult to be understood as the Jesuits pretended, how could there be milk for babes, and strong meat for men, who, having read them, departed not empty, neither went away hungry? If thirteen years were required to the reading and study of the Scriptures, before any one could lawfully expound them, might it not be supposed that such an expositor would be rarely found in popery, though carefully sought with a candle? The Jesuits gave the principal honour not to those who were most conversant with the Old and New Testament, but to those who could best acquit themselves in duns and dorbel, Lombard and Gratian, at whose breasts their divines sucked their first milk in theology. And why should they employ thirteen years in the study of the Scriptures, if they might give no other interpretation of any place than that which had been received by their forefathers?"

Mr. Cartwright admitted that protestants were content that their religion should be condemned by those who condemned the reading of the Scriptures; and that they were willing to wait patiently until the Lord should come to inflict judgment upon all wicked and blasphemous speeches against him and his holy word. In the trial of the cause by outward fruits, he said it ought to be remembered that, of four sorts of ground sown by the seed of the gospel, only one was fruitful. The rest were no better for the preaching of the gospel; but to condemn the fruit which the good ground produced, with the barrenness and unprofitableness of the others, would not be equal and upright judgment. Though sin reigned in time of popery, it could not be sufficiently seen. There

was no light from the law of God by which to discover it, because the candle of knowledge was put out. "But by the faithful ministry of the gospel, the beams of divine truth shine so bright, that what in popish darkness was holden to be no sin, is now discovered to be sin; and that which then seemed only a small sin, the gospel shows to be very aggravating in the sight of God. To condemn the mote that is in our eye as greater than the beam that is in their eye, which their ignorance will not let them see, is not holding an even hand, nor exercising an impartial judgment. It is the old practice of Satan to charge the professors of the gospel with disordered manners; so it ought not to surprise any one if it be now renewed by the adversaries of truth."

Mr. Cartwright then asked the Jesuits what compassion they had for their countrymen, seeing they had, for so many years, kept from them the word of God, having engrossed to themselves the gain of life, and the bread of eternal life? Nor was their impiety less in *poisoning* the people than it was before in *starving* them. He then added, "We have found Christ in the Scriptures, and conclude we are within the true church; but you, who hold not the Head, cannot be of the body, which is His church. We follow the light of the Scriptures on all questions about religion, and have the promise of the resolution of all our doubts: but you, who allow not the Scriptures to give any light in the decision of many points, miserably run yourselves into condemnation."*

2. *Translation from the Latin Vulgate.*†

Mr. Cartwright defended the holy Scriptures against the accusation of corruption, and maintained that the Old and New Testa-

* The circulation of the Scriptures in the mother tongue is always uncongenial to the taste of tyrannizing ecclesiastics, who wish to keep the people in darkness and servitude. On these grounds the efforts of the celebrated John Wycliffe were vehemently opposed; and in the clerical council assembled in 1408, with Archbishop Arundel at their head, it was decreed, "That the translation of Holy Scriptures out of one tongue into another is a dangerous thing. Therefore we enact and adorn that no one henceforth translate any text of the holy Scriptures into the English tongue, or any other, by way of book or treatise; nor let any such book or treatise lately composed in the time of John Wycliffe, or since, or hereafter to be composed, be read in whole or in part, in public or in private, under the pain of the greater excommunication!"—*Wycliffe's Tracts*, p. lxi.

† It is observed that Pope Sixtus V. published an edition of the Vulgate in 1530; and in the bull which he prefixed to it, he excommunicated all who, in reprinting the

ments, written in the original languages, were preserved uncorrupted. They constituted the word of God, whose works are all perfect, then must his word continue unimpaired; and, since it was written for our instruction, admonition, and consolation, he concluded that, unless God was deceived and disappointed in his purpose, it must perform these friendly offices for the church of God to the end of the world. If the authority of the authentic copies in Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek were lost, or given up, or corrupted, or the sense changed, there would be no high court of appeal to put an end to disputes; so that the exhortation to have recourse to the law, the prophets, and the New Testament would be of very little effect. In this case our state would be worse than theirs under the law, and in the time of Christ; yea than those who lived some hundred years after Christ, when the ancient fathers exhorted the people to try all controversies by the Scriptures. Their own Gratian directs us, in deciding differences, not to the old translation, but to the originals of the Hebrew in the Old Testament, and of the Greek in the New.

The Jesuits surmised that protestants had abridged the privileges of the churches, because they gave them not so ample immunities as in the days of the apostles. To this Mr. Cartwright replied, "Woe unto the churches, if the Scriptures, the charters and records of heaven be destroyed, falsified, or corrupted. These divine charters were safely kept in one nation of the Jews; and though they were sometimes unfaithful, yet they kept the keys of the Lord's library: but now, when many nations have the keys, it is altogether incredible that any such corruptions should enter in, as the adversaries unwisely suppose. If the Lord preserved the book of Leviticus, with the account of the ancient ceremonies, which were afterward abolished, how much more may we conclude that his providence has watched over other books of Scripture which properly belong to our times and to our salvation? Will not the Scriptures bear witness to the perpetuity of their own authority? 'Secret things belong to God; but things revealed belong to us,

work, should make any alteration of the text! It was, nevertheless, so incorrect that his successor, Gregory XIV., entirely suppressed it; and Pope Clement VIII., who succeeded Gregory, published a corrected edition! The differences between these two editions, it is added, amount to some thousands. Does infallibility, then, never make any mistakes? —*Orme's Bibliotheca Bib.* p. 452.

and to our children for ever.' Jesus Christ said, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away.' Notwithstanding the sacred writings were disregarded, and even hated by most persons, they had been preserved entire as they were the first day they were given to the church of God. More than fifteen hundred years had elapsed, during which not any one book, nor part of any book, of canonical Scripture had been lost: and it was evident not only that the matter of the Scripture, but also the words; not only the sense and meaning, but also the manner and form of speech in them remained unaltered."

Mr. Cartwright reminded the Jesuits that they deserved to wear their old clothes: for they considered the *age* of a translation its first and principal commendation; so that, if they could have obtained the translation amended by Jerome, they would no doubt have used it, because of its hoary head. If this should be considered a good reason, why should not those which were still more ancient, as those of Symmachus, Acquila, and Theodosius, be preferred? And why should not the seventy be most of all preferred, which was often used by the apostles, and highly commended by the ancient fathers? But, as grey hairs were honourable only "when found in the way of righteousness," so the age of the translation ought to be reverenced and esteemed only so far as it contains a true and faithful translation of the word of God. But, if antiquity commended to them that translation which was upwards of thirteen hundred years old, surely the Greek copies, which were more ancient, and had been used upwards of *fifteen* hundred years, ought to be accounted superior, and worthy of greater esteem.

As to the version adopted by the Rhemists, Mr. Cartwright observed that all the soap and nitre they could collect would be insufficient to cleanse the Vulgate from the filth of blood in which it was originally conceived, and had since collected in passing so long through the hands of unlearned monks, from which the Greek copies had altogether escaped. For, till these later times, when the Romanists have been awakened by the professors of the gospel, their unskilfulness in the Greek language was so notorious that they occasioned the proverb, "It is Greek, and cannot be read!" He, however, refused to take advantage of that which might have crept in by the slip of the pen, or the carelessness of the printer; and

he discovered a nobler mind than to notice such slips, when there were almost innumerable foul corruptions, many of which were intolerable and blasphemous. The Rhemists, he further observed, so despised and contemned the holy Scriptures in the original languages, that they could hardly be considered as possessed of reason. They condemned without reason: but protestants might not suspect on the ground of great probability. They placed in the text that which they pleased, contrary to the authority of the Greek copies: but protestants might not give an opinion of their annotations on the text. They could not bear to be accused of their errors: but protestants must be charged with slips and mistakes already reformed. Their hatred against the Greek copies was so great that they could not endure Beza's modest reprehension of them, unless he would condemn them as they did; and they had so little equity, that they could see the mote in his eye, but could not perceive the beam in their own eye. If in any places there was such difficulty as could not be cleared, which was by no means admitted, it was deemed more proper to confess our ignorance than charge the Greek copies with untruth.

Mr. Cartwright concluded the discussion of this point by thus addressing the Rhemists: "The principal reason why you have taken up arms against the Greek copies is that you are not of God, and therefore cannot abide God's word. As the old translation is further from the word of God, it suits you better than the Greek copies. You may sooner get water out of flint than any advantage to your cause from the Greek copies: yet, if it were possible for truth to help to maintain an untruth, it would be impossible for you to like it; therefore you had great advantage to your own cause from the Vulgate, but none from the Greek. We know that you had a further object in preferring the handmaid to the mistress; and that was to undermine and overthrow the authority of the word of God, and establish the pope's decrees, which cannot be admitted, so long as the authority of the holy Scriptures remaineth. If it be as you say, that the Greek serveth your cause better than the Vulgate, you undesignedly bear us witness that the small estimation which we have for your Vulgate proceeds not from any fear that it would hurt our cause."

3. *Method of Translation.*

Mr. Cartwright entered on this part of the controversy by showing that the Rhemish translation was not catholic, but so proud and scornful that all sober people discarded it. A good translator would endeavour to give the meaning of his author, with all simplicity and plainness. He then asks, "What are the sacred words and speeches which you have retained? If you had translated the Greek, you might have made some pretensions to this. We all acknowledge the writings of the apostles and evangelists to have been *sacred*, which cannot be applied to the old Latin translation; unless your Council of Trent, coming so many years after, could make that sacred which was not so before."

He reminded the Rhemists that, in multiplied instances, they had corrupted and wrested the holy Scriptures. Their translating by the tale of words, rather than by the weight of sense, was altogether childish and unworthy of learned men. By their translation they had corrupted the pure word of God; and by their annotations they had wrested, twisted, and corrupted the sense of the translation, and made it no better than filthy dross. The words of Jerome, he observed, would justly apply to their work: "You make the gospel of Christ the gospel of man, or, that which is worse, the gospel of the devil." If the Rhemists had given the people their translation alone, notwithstanding all its errors, the people would have found some relief from it in time of famine; but, perceiving this, they feared to publish their translation without a ponderous load of annotations, recommending their doctrines, and condemning those of the protestants. By this unrighteous process, they unintentionally testified against themselves that the Holy Spirit of God spoke nothing for them, and that they could find nothing in the Scriptures to favour their cause, without twisting and wresting it by their numerous annotations.

Mr. Cartwright proved not only that the Rhemists had superstitiously observed the order of words, but also that they had often rendered the sense both ridiculous and impious by retaining the like number of words. In confirmation of this, he enumerated several instances. By their jesuitical translation, they had turned the most comfortable portions of Scripture into bitter wormwood and deadly poison. To this question, "Who shall accuse the elect

of God?" they subjoined this answer, "God which justifieth!" making God the accuser of his own elect. To another important question, "Who is he that shall condemn?" they annexed this answer, "Christ Jesus that died!" which is contrary to the phraseology and meaning of the apostle. Another impudent corruption, which prevails throughout their translation, it would be improper to omit. Instead of the phrase, "The Lord," they have inserted, "Our Lord," contrary to the old Latin Vulgate, as well as to that of the Greek. Thus they falsified the word of the living God. They laid up the vulgar translation as in the ark of the Lord, and cast away the original, written with the finger of God, serving their own popish purposes; and, to accomplish this, they put out and put in to serve their own pleasure. Though the former fault might be imputed to oversight, yet the latter of *adding*, of which they were continually guilty, could be nothing short of the claim of mastership and rabbinism in the church of Christ! Mr. Cartwright then adds, "If you could prove us guilty of one such instance of boldness in the translation of the whole Bible, we would cover our faces, and our answer should remain in silence. We clearly see what wind has driven you upon this sand. You have chosen to speak otherwise than as the Scriptures direct you, rather than you would speak as we do. We have no objection to speak in your language, whenever the text of Scripture leads to it. You have made the wall of separation from us very high; and you might, with less contempt of the word of God, have made it still higher. But the Lord hath discovered your hateful abominations, in deceitfully handling the word of life."

Mr. Cartwright, having discussed the subject contained in the preface, commented on the preliminary observations of the Rhemists. Though they declared the writings of men "in no case equal to the most sacred authority of the canonical Scriptures," yet they concluded that the authority of the *church* was greater than that of God's holy word; which Mr. Cartwright considered "out of measure, absurd, and blasphemous." To illustrate the subject, he observed that the authority of John Baptist was not superior to that of Christ; neither was any one who furnished information concerning the king of greater authority than the king; nor he who kept the charters of the city of greater authority

than the charters themselves. To the church was appointed to keep the law of God, not to judge the law, but to judge by the law. The Lord was so far from submitting his word to the judgment of sinful men that he would not allow the holy angels to be its judges, who incurred an horrible curse if they taught any other doctrine; by which the authority of the word was advanced above the authority of all creatures on earth and in heaven. Hence appeared the important sentiment of Tertullian, of admitting that doctrine only which the church received from the apostles, and which rested simply on the authority of God; but to grant that the authority of the Scriptures was subject to the judgment of the church would betray most blind and intolerable arrogance.

The crown of authority which in former times was placed on the heads of the prophets and apostles was never transferred to the church, but with great solemnity put upon the holy Scriptures, which all the craft and power of man could never remove; therefore no Christian men ought to suffer themselves to be carried away from trial by the Scriptures. As the Scriptures were inspired of God, and holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, so they must be interpreted by the same authority; and whatsoever interpretation was not derived from that authority was of private interpretation, and not by the authority of God. Divine authority was not in man, but in the Scriptures; therefore the Scriptures were authentic, and sufficient to guide the interpretation of the church. That interpretation which was derived even from general councils was not to be received on any other conditions. The Romanists, who call for the judgment of the church, ignorantly trust in the early fathers and councils for expounding the Scriptures, especially on subjects pertaining to present controversies. That we may know who are the principal workmen, whom Christ, the Arch-builder, ordained for building his church, and the exhortation to a close observance of the Scriptures without the least deviation from them, the apostle added the powerful reason: "Because there would be false teachers among them, who would bring in pernicious heresies;" showing that, in the determination of these controversies, we should not suffer our faith and judgment to be led away by the opinions of men, but only by the authority of the Scriptures.

"When the Lord Jesus urged his disciples to 'call no man father or master on earth,' we are taught not to trust in man, but in the Lord alone. If we bestow the utmost diligence, it will be of no avail, but end in disappointment, unless the Holy Spirit of God illuminate our benighted minds; and there will be no difficulty in concluding whether God will work by the instrumentality of his holy word rather than by means which men have devised, especially as we have his promise that his word and Spirit shall work harmoniously together. The apostle shows that the holy Scriptures are intended to convince the adversary, as well as to teach the disciple; but this is utterly superseded by those who maintain that the judgment of the church is the final end of all controversy. The force of the holy Scriptures is evidently set forth by Paul, who, out of the Scriptures, disputed with the Jews, opening to them that Christ must needs die and rise again, and that Jesus whom he preached was Christ. Apollos also by the Scriptures convinced the Jews that Jesus was Christ. They may, therefore, renew the old complaint, 'To whom shall we go?' when every thing is provided in the Scriptures. But when men depart from their authority, and depend on the authority of mortals, 'do they not exchange light for darkness, and the pure waters of life for the filth of the world?'"

The reader will doubtless expect some account of Mr. Cartwright's Annotations, in reply to those of the Rhemists; and a few specimens will probably afford some gratification. In his comment on Matthew i., he charges the catholics with "chopping and hacking" the holy Scriptures in their "epistles and gospels," contrary to the order which God had appointed and his churches had practised. The church of Rome, said he, had not only declared her irreverence of the word of God by rending that which God had conjoined, but also betrayed great unskilfulness in mangling inspired truth, by "cutting and slashing," without consideration of the coherence and suitableness of one subject, or of one sentence with another. She hath betrayed the intolerable impudence of adding to the word of God, and of changing the same at pleasure, without any note of difference between the grave language of Scripture and their barbarous inventions. These modest men, forsooth, with open mouths exclaim of our boldness in altering

texts of Scripture; "whereas, if they were able to show a gleaning in us of that whereof we can show abundance in them, we should be in hope of some modesty from them."

Upon Matthew xvi. 17, 18, Mr. Cartwright, having recited the sentiments of the Rhemists, that Christ appointed Peter to be the foundation of his church, that his faith would render him infallible, and that his pre-eminence was the recompense of his making the first avowal of the Saviour's divinity; to which he replied, that here Peter's primacy received a deadly wound. For, if it were necessary that the primacy over the church should follow the first confession of the Saviour's divinity, Peter came too late to wear the crown, being prevented by numbers, and even by women, who made this confession before him. The other apostles acknowledged this doctrine, as well as Peter, seeing Christ forbade them to publish it abroad; but the Rhemists, to exalt Peter, openly denied this, and ought to have blushed at their own ignorance. Did the Lord Jesus send his twelve apostles into all Galilee to preach Him unto the people before they knew and acknowledged him?

In further addressing the Rhemists, he said, "Lest you should think that we are driven upon your interpretation by the puff of your proofs, we will show the small force in your reasons, and the shameless treachery in abusing the testimony of the fathers, not only as they with one consent directly fight against you, but also the very interpretation which you have followed is almost as generally forsaken by them." This he fully proved by an appeal to their testimony; after which he refuted the popish notion of the apostle Peter's supremacy. It was manifest, said he, that the rest of the apostles received their authority as immediately from Christ as did Peter, and they were all equally chosen by him. The conquest of the world to the obedience of faith, by the preaching of the word, was not committed to Peter alone, that he should allot every man his share in this service, but unto all alike. The Holy Spirit, by whose aid they were fitted for so great an enterprise, came down not only upon Peter, from whom it descended to the other apostles, but equally upon all. The apostles of Christ had no rule one over another; and whatsoever effectual means Peter used in communicating the blessings of the gospel, the other

apostles employed the same. They preached, administered the sacraments, prayed, bestowed the gifts of the Holy Ghost, ordained ministers, and decided controversies, as well as he; and they conferred these benefits not merely on the church at Rome, to make it the store-house of all the world, whence all other churches should receive blessings at second hand, but also upon all the rest of the churches. As the Rhemists make Peter guilty of doing notable injury to the rest of the apostles, so they are charged with notable treason against God, whose crown and dignity they set on Peter's head!

In answer to the popish opinion that the prerogatives of Peter did not die with him, but were perpetuated to his successors at Rome, he observed that the apostles never had any successors; which appeared not only from the unequivocal testimony of the fathers, but also from the election of Matthias to supply the place of Judas, and from the consultation of the apostles in choosing one to succeed James when he was cut off by the sword. As Peter did not possess the authority and prerogatives which the Jesuits ascribe to him, so no bishop on earth ever had the authority which Peter possessed. Neither any bishop, nor all the bishops in the world, ever had the prerogative of securing themselves against erring from the truth, which Peter had. But what privilege soever Peter had, it availed nothing, unless the Bishop of Rome had the same. As the authority of the other apostles was equal to that of Peter, so what advantage could this be to the pope more than to other bishops who came after the other apostles? Mr. Cartwright then inquired, "Could the Rhemists show that Peter had his privileges as a fee simple, but the rest of the apostles were tenants only for the term of their lives? Had Peter made his successors so rich and so mighty that they had all, and could do all; while the rest of the apostles had left theirs so beggarly and so impotent that they had nothing, and could do nothing, any further than they were helped by the Bishop of Rome? If there were such orders between Peter's successors, and the successors of the other apostles, yet," he asked, "how it came to pass that there was such inequality among Peter's supposed successors themselves? It was also well known that Peter preached first at Jerusalem, afterward at Lidda, then at Joppa, at Antioch, at Cæsarea, and at Alexandria,

before he went to Rome, if he went there at all. Why then were not the bishops of those churches Peter's successors, as well as the Bishop of Rome? And if they were his successors as well as he, why should they not have equal prerogatives from Peter as he had? But here it would be answered that Peter was martyred and crucified at Rome, and this secured the blessing from all others! How could this so far secure the blessing as to place that church on the top of the highest hill in the world, whence it might imperiously overlook all others, the words of Christ threatening the cities which rejected his ambassadors sufficiently declare. It was marvellous that the shedding of innocent blood, which polluted other places, should sanctify Rome; and that the Lord should deprive Jerusalem of its privileges above all the cities in the world for spilling the blood of the prophets, should reward Rome by lifting up her head above all other cities for shedding the blood of the apostles sent unto her! As Rome was more drunken with the blood of the saints, under the imperial government, than any other city, therefore, by the righteous judgment of God, it became the seat of antichrist."

The Rhemists maintained, from Luke xxii. 31, not only that the apostle Peter possessed spiritual supremacy, but also that he was even "the head of the church," that "he should for ever confirm, establish, or uphold the rest in their faith," and that the popes descended by succession from this apostle. To these daring statements, Mr. Cartwright replied that the popes could not be Peter's successors, unless Peter's prerogatives were conveyed to them by his abjuring Christ. If Peter, by his fall, gained such privileges, how much more ought John, who entered into the high priest's hall as well as Peter, and went out without the breach of his faith in Christ, while Peter almost made shipwreck. If Peter had been surnamed, as John was, whom the Lord loved—if he had leaned upon his breast, as John did—if he had committed the care of his mother to Peter, as he did to John—if he had revealed the state of the whole church to the end of the world to Peter, as he did to John, which were privileges and pre-eminences above the rest, there might have been some pretended ground for their unworthy plea. To prove Peter's supremacy, they wrested the holy Scriptures; but to prove the pope's succession to that supremacy, they could not find so

much as a single word in its defence. They, therefore, always borrow their proofs from men; yet, in borrowing them, they have taken them oftentimes against their will. This he shows by appealing to their authorities; by which also he demonstrates that the bishops were sometimes heretics, or notable for enormous vices and cruel persecution. So much for Peter's supposed supremacy, and the pope's succession from that apostle!

Mr. Cartwright, in his comment on Matt. xxvi. 26, and 1 Cor. xi. 29, shows that the sacrifice of the mass for the benefit of the dead was opposed to the sentiments of ancient writers, as well as to the unequivocal testimony of holy Scripture and the nature of the sacrament, and was an obvious forgery, misleading and deceiving the people. According to the apostle, the benefits of Christ's death were received by faith, and faith came by hearing the word: but the dead could neither exercise faith nor hear the word preached; therefore there could be no application of Christ's death by this unmeaning sacrifice. As this dumb mass could neither be heard nor seen by the dead, so it was impossible to do them good. The mass was indeed chaunted to the living, and the outward sound reached their ears: yet the apostle would not allow this to be hearing and receiving the word of God, but the sound vanished without producing any scriptural improvement in their minds; so that the dumb mass, unsupported by the fathers or any part of the Scriptures, was not only an unprofitable, but also a delusive contrivance of men.

He reminded the Rhemists that, in "forbidding the people to touch the sacramental bread with common hands," they opposed the Lord Jesus Christ, who set forth the sacrament with a godly freedom from such prohibition; but they endeavoured to place it in the stocks. He then asked them whether it was not enough to bring men into the superstition of not *tasting*, but they must also forge a new manacle to bind their hand from *touching?* This, however, was a small thing with them, to carry the mark of superstition mentioned by the apostle, unless they carried also the brand of the proud Pharisees, the sworn enemies of Jesus Christ. He further asked, "Where do you read that the hands of all the people are common or unclean? Have you not read that those whom Christ hath washed are altogether clean? And if they be wholly clean, how can their hands be unclean? What nitre and soap hath the

priest with which to scour his hands, that his hands should be clean and all the people's foul? And, if the hand be not clean to receive it, how is the mouth, which receiveth the same pollution from the heart? And should there be more reverence in receiving the holy sacrament in an unsavoury garment than by that hand which was bought with the precious blood of the Son of God?" So it appeared that here also that which the church of God rejected as a disgusting ceremony was espoused as an ornament in the popish church.

The Rhemists, as Mr. Cartwright clearly showed, not only failed to furnish so much as one testimony from the Scriptures in support of transubstantiation, but also that the writings of the fathers were directly against them. It followed therefore that, as their views of the sacrament were not from Christ, but from antichrist, they ought to be rejected. He next recited a train of ancient writers who affirmed that the doctrine of transubstantiation could not be proved either from the Scriptures or from the fathers, which, in his opinion, ought to have admonished them of the impudency of attempting to do both. But, if they refused to be admonished, the indifferent reader might easily judge what likelihood there was of their faithful dealing in rescuing the places of Scripture and the fathers from the fetters in which heretics had bound them; especially as the strongest advocates of popery confessed that they contained not even the shadow of transubstantiation! That which was baked in a common furnace, having no heat coming down from heaven, could not be divine; and the erection of another table in the church was of very dangerous consequence. "You mean," said he, "thus to honour and discern the Lord's body by visiting it only once in the year! Instead of the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, you have brought in an abominable idol of your own; and, seeing your God is an alien, so your worship is strange, neither acknowledged by the Scriptures, nor sustained by antiquity, nor so much as saluted 'God save it,' by any of the churches remaining in any tolerable state of God's people, be you assured that, as the Lord hath already rebuked you, and blessed his church, so he will utterly confound you, and establish his church to all eternity."

Mr. Cartwright, in his dispute with Dr. Whitgift, had endeavoured to show the impossibility of any creature being the head of

the church of Christ. He also fearlessly controverted this doctrine with the Rhemists; and, in his comment on Eph. i. 22, he remarked that the apostle gave this title unto Jesus Christ to raise Him above all powers and dominions on earth or in heaven. But, if this title belonged to the pope, or to any man on earth, it was manifest that there was a power on earth whereto Christ had not a superior title. For the same reason that the Jesuits might give this title to a man, they might give him the title of "the beginning and first-born from the dead," which the apostle inseparably joined together. The demonstrative article, whereby the Scriptures appropriated unto one that which excluded all others, was here decisive; as when the apostle saith that "Christ *is the* head," that is, he and no other. "And when all the ministers of the church are enumerated in Scripture, they all fall short of being the head; therefore no ministry, how high soever, can, without untruth, be called head. Jesus Christ is called *the* head, because he giveth life and motion, health and strength, as well as existence, to the whole body, which the pope cannot do—because, without Christ, the church would fade and die, but, without the pope, it may live and prosper—and because it is impossible for the pope, or any mere creature, to possess the qualifications which are absolutely necessary to constitute the head of the church. Is not the Lord Jesus, who shutteth and no man openeth, who openeth and no man shutteth, the only Lord and King of his church? And does not the pope, in claiming to be head of the church, manifestly claim more than did even the apostles of Jesus Christ? And is it not contrary to nature, and even monstrous, that any one body should have more heads than one?"

In these strictures, we behold Mr. Cartwright fearlessly attacking the bulwarks of popery, and the formidable weapons which he employed in this warfare. But these are only specimens of the armour used in this contest; and, if the reader would obtain a full view of the great dispute, he must follow the author as he follows the Rhemists, through all the multifarious errors and superstitions contained in the papal system. Here is presented a condensed view of the antichristian character of popery, with a formidable defence of protestantism, in which Mr. Cartwright brought his powerful intellect and critical knowledge into full requisition. Though the work is not perfect, but savours of the unpolished age which gave

it birth, yet, making due allowance, we are persuaded that no intelligent and unbiassed reader, who seeks to advance the cause of truth, will find it easy to withstand the just discrimination, profound erudition, theological acumen, and powerful efficiency with which the author assails the strongholds of popery, and defends the truth and kingdom of Jesus Christ. Mr. Cartwright showed that the Rhemists' translation betrayed numerous corruptions, which their annotations were introduced to defend; and he exposed the corruptions of the former, and the fallacious criticism by which they were attempted to be sustained by the latter. He laid open to the eyes of the world numerous errors, superstitions, and delusions contained in the whole body of popery; and, by sound learning and invincible argument, defended the grand protestant doctrines against the unjust cavils and frivolous objections of the Romanists. All the points in dispute between catholics and protestants were learnedly discussed, and Mr. Cartwright displayed so extensive an acquaintance with the sacred Scriptures, as well as great power of controversial abilities, that his work was, and still is, considered a notable piece of controversy.* The manuscript copy of this work is preserved in the archiepiscopal collection at Lambeth.†

The controversy with the Rhemists was not confined to Mr. Cartwright, but other learned divines took part in this formidable dispute. Dr. Fulke, a divine of great fame in the popish controversy, published two works of great celebrity. The former was an answer to Martin's "Discovery of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scripture by the Hereticks of our Days, and of their Foul Dealing by Partial and False Translations," Oct. 1582. It is entitled, "A Defence of the Sincere and True Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue, against the Manifold Cavels, Frivolous Quarrels, and Impudent Slanders of Gregorie Martin," fol. 1583. In this work, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, the doctor acted on the defensive, but did not stop there. Having found that Mr. Cartwright had received a prohibition from his grace of Canterbury, he entered more fully and minutely into the

* Lowndes' Manual, vol. i. p. 356; Bibliotheca Sussexiana, vol. ii. p. 562.

† Lambeth MSS. vol. ccccliii.

controversy by publishing his celebrated work, entitled "The Text of the New Testament of Jesus Christ, translated out of the Vulgar Latine by the Papists of the Traiterous Seminarie at Rhems," fol. 1589. This work was accompanied with the Bishops' Bible in parallel columns. The notes are extensive and valuable. The doctor did not undertake this work by the desire of Whitgift. He was one of the Cambridge divines who had importuned Mr. Cartwright to answer the Rhemists; after whose prohibition, being persuaded that an answer was indispensably necessary, he undertook it himself. He dedicated the work to her Majesty, and carefully stated, not only that his work was only *provisional*, but also that the public might expect a more elaborate and complete answer from the pen of Mr. Cartwright. "Not meaning to prejudice the more learned labours, and longer studied commentaries of those who had taken the matter in hand before him, if they proposed, at length, to bring them to light, but to provide, in the mean time, that, by a short and sufficient reply, the weak may be confirmed, the doubtful satisfied, and the insolency of the adversaries silenced."

In addition to these productions, Dr. Bilson, afterward Bishop of of Winchester, published "A Demonstration that the Things Reformed in the Church of England are Truely Catholick, against the Rhemish Testament," Oct. 1585. Dr. Bulkley also published "An Answer to Ten Frivolous and Foolish Reasons set down by the Rhemish Jesuits and Papists in their Preface before the New Testament," quar. 1588, which he dedicated to Sir Francis Walsingham.

All these publications exhibit the same general view of this formidable debate, and prove how great a degree of interest was felt among learned divines to refute the errors and superstitions of popery; and, without making an invidious comparison, they all, no doubt, proved of signal advantage, not only in stemming the progress of injurious doctrines, but also in defending and diffusing the important truths of the gospel. The celebrated Wycliffe had, at an earlier period, shown that, according to "the doctrine of popery, the pope might exclude any book from the canon of Holy Writ, might introduce any novelty into its place, might alter the whole Bible, and make the very Scriptures heresy, establishing as

catholic what was opposed to truth;" adding, "to whatever the pope might decree, obedience must be instantly rendered."* But when learned men devoted their time and talents to counteract the progress of error, and to promote the truth and kingdom of Jesus Christ, their conduct was deserving of universal commendation, especially from the official guardians of morality and religion; but when men of rank interrupted these praiseworthy efforts, though they might gratify a party, yet they could have little concern for the honour of God and the welfare of man. The reader is aware that Mr. Cartwright, for the toilsome labours of his pen, was deserving of other kind of remuneration than that which he received. Having so powerfully counteracted the progress of popery, and so successfully defended unadulterated Christianity, exhibiting so decided a triumph in this holy warfare, and conferring such signal benefits upon the church of God, instead of interruption or any other annoyance, he had a powerful claim on the best wishes, strongest sympathy, and warmest gratitude of all persons worthy of the name of protestants.

* Wycliffe's Tracts, p. lii. liv.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONVENED BEFORE THE BISHOP — STATE OF THE HOSPITAL AT WARWICK—DISPUTE WITH BROWNISTS—ARRAIGNED BEFORE THE HIGH-COMMISSION—COMMITTED TO PRISON.

Mr. Cartwright counted the cost of the cause which he espoused. Uninfluenced by worldly considerations, and unmoved by the prospect of danger, he conscientiously adhered to what he believed to be the truth of God, and to be essential to the organization and government of Christian churches. He was a zealous advocate of ecclesiastical purity, and of the diffusion of Christianity unencumbered with the traditions of men; for which, though deserving of more humane treatment, he endured long and severe sufferings. He lived at a time when the free operation of religious principle was disallowed, especially by the higher ecclesiastical orders, who ought to have been the most active patrons and promoters of generous sentiments; but instead of which, many of them tyrannized with wanton cruelty over worthy ministers who scrupulously disbelieved their dogmas and disapproved their assumption of arbitrary power.

It is well known that all men are not born with understandings of the same dimensions, nor with eyes to see things in exactly the same light, nor yet with minds to receive precisely similar impressions. By the exercise of diversified intellects, some will receive convictions, and cherish opinions widely different from those of others; showing the necessity of mutual forbearance and Christian moderation, a very small portion of which was extended to the subject of this narrative. His hospital at Warwick being exempt from prelatical jurisdiction, ought to have been a secure asylum;

nevertheless, the outstretched power of the bishops would not suffer him to live in the quietude of home. He was accordingly accused to Bishop Freke, a zealous advocate of the church,* and was summoned to appear in his consistory at Worcester to answer the charges to be brought against him. Being in great favour with several of the nobility, he was attended by those who hated oppression and espoused the cause of freedom. The bishop expected, on this occasion, the assistance of two distinguished prebendaries, who, on pretence of business, retired into the country; so his lordship was left alone in extreme despondency. Dr. John Longworth, at this juncture, unexpectedly arrived, which contributed to revive his lordship's drooping spirit, and to sooth his sorrow. He entered heartily into all the proceedings, declaring that no one knew Mr. Cartwright better than himself, having been fellows in the same college, and nearly of the same standing.

When our divine appeared in the consistory court, he was thus addressed: "Mr. Cartwright, you are accused of disturbing the peace and quietness of the church by innovations, and *obtruding* fancies and devices of your own or others. You have brought over with you the dregs of Geneva, whereby you would instil into the minds of the queen's subjects that your doctrine is the only truth to be embraced and entertained. You had best take heed that you run not upon the same rock on which the papists split, and draw upon yourself the same penalty that is ordained for those who alienate the hearts of the subjects both from their prince and religion!"

Mr. Cartwright, contrary to these imputations, had never disturbed the public peace, nor attempted to obtrude his opinions on any one. If obtrusion was a crime, his adversaries *alone* were guilty. He had only claimed the liberty of thinking and believing for himself, cheerfully allowing the same to all others. Obtrusion and coercion belonged exclusively to those who attempted, by *force*, to compel their fellow Christians to subscribe their creed, to observe their ceremonies, to conform to their church, and to receive the standard of religion which they had devised. When the dominant judges compared him to treasonable papists, it is difficult to ascertain whether their ignorance or perverseness was most pre-

* Wood, vol. i. p. 732.

dominant. Mr. Cartwright, however, did not return railing for railing, but the contrary. To their foul imputations, he only replied that he had the word of God for his warrant, and the practice of the reformed churches for his example. Dr. Longworth reminded him of their old acquaintance at the university: then accused him of having always been of a "factious disposition, and of a discontented mind;" and that, by his travels abroad, he had "perfected that humour to the height of persuasion to which he had arrived." Having thrown out these reflections, the doctor challenged him to a public disputation; but Mr. Cartwright, unwilling to bring himself into danger, wisely declined; after which he was dismissed without punishment or further censure.* Had Dr. Longworth reflected on his own past history, when he opposed the imposition of clerical vestments, and promoted the principles of ecclesiastical reform; had he recollected that, to escape danger, he had relinquished his opinions, and, like many others, "pledged himself to repress future irregularities;" and especially if he had looked back upon his own disorderly conduct in the university, for which Bishop Cox expelled him from the mastership of St. John's College, as "a man far unmeet" to occupy that office, it might have cooled his temper, diminished his haughtiness, and rendered him less severe, as well as less censorious, of our divine.†

Mr. Cartwright, on this occasion, came off quite as well as he had any reason to expect; and, with a clear conscience, he returned to his beloved religious exercises at Warwick. He manifested an ardent concern for the welfare of his flock and for the prosperity of the hospital; but, by the death of the Earl of Leicester in 1588, and the death of his brother, usually styled "the good Earl of Warwick," toward the close of 1589, he was involved in extreme perplexity, and called to long and toilsome solicitude about the institution, whose endowments were in danger of alienation. This appears from his letter to the Lord Treasurer Burghley, dated June 30, 1590; in which he observed that he made conscience of troubling his lordship with particular causes, whose continued strength was consecrated to the welfare of the country. The case which he brought before his lordship was so pressing, and his

* Baker's MSS. vol. xxviii. p. 443—445.

† Soames' Elizabeth, p. 60, 61; Lansdowne MSS. vol. xi. art. 69.

lordship was, he understood, the only person from whom relief could be obtained; he found himself constrained, in most humble suit, to appear before his lordship: first and principally in behalf of the poor hospital; and, secondly, in his own behalf.

The cause, if it would please his lordship, was this: The late Right Honourable the Earl of Leicester endowed the hospital at Warwick with two hundred pounds a-year; whereof one hundred and fifty was for the support of twelve poor men, and the remaining fifty for the stipend of the master, whom he required to be a preacher. For the accomplishment of this charity, he gave certain lands in Warwickshire and Lancashire, whose rents, when raised to the highest, amounted to that sum and no more. These lands, about three years before the Earl of Leicester's death, he conveyed by deed to this hospital; but, because the deed was not enrolled within the year, according to the trust, he put in one Mr. Sutton of Lincoln, which, in strict construction of law, was deemed insufficient. The house was, therefore, compelled to take a second grant of the Honourable the Earl of Warwick. The Earl of Leicester, over and above the stipend of the master, gave Mr. Cartwright, by letters patent, an additional annuity of fifty pounds during his life, not charged, indeed, out of any certain lands, but payable by him and his heirs, receivers general. This was considered by the learned in the law to be good as long as the heir was possessed of assets, or otherwise, wheresoever the land should be situated, if he had issued a writ of annuity before the lands had come into the hands of a stranger. This he might have done; but it was not meet for him to call such honourable persons in question of law, especially those to whom he was so greatly beholden.

It was said that her Majesty's *extent* would go forth upon all the lands the Earl of Leicester possessed, either at the time of his death or in the twenty-fourth year of her Majesty's reign; by which not only would his stipend be lost, but, which was far more lamentable, the whole body of twelve poor, old, impotent men would be constrained to beg, and, for the time to come, would be in danger of being utterly scattered and overthrown. He also reminded his lordship that the hospital could not obtain of the Countess of Leicester any part of the legacy of two hundred pounds which the late earl had devised by will; the master was,

therefore, constrained to lay out the charges of one-half year before he received one penny of the rent appointed for the maintenance of the hospital: all of which he should be obliged to lease, if the extent should come upon all the earl's lands, without exception, before the half year's rent became due. To move commiseration in favour of the hospital, he wished his lordship to recollect that of the two hundred pounds of yearly rent, twenty pounds had been demanded, from the death of the Earl of Leicester, by the unjust dealing of one Mr. Ugnol, a rich citizen, and one who, comparing his great wealth with the extreme poverty at the hospital, attempted to defraud the institution of the twenty pounds for ever.

Mr. Cartwright, in further addressing his lordship, made reference to his unceasing labours and suits in behalf of the hospital ever since the death of the noble founder; by which, contrary to his disposition and education, he had been constrained to give attendance in London during term; and, contrary to his poor estate, he had been forced upon heavy charges for the hospital, without the prospect of obtaining the least remuneration. Were it not for the perpetuity of so good a work to posterity, and the duty he owed to the deceased earl, that the good work might be honourably and faithfully preserved from being overthrown, he would not have endured so long and so painful a trial. He left unnoticed the living from which the noble earl had taken him to occupy the mastership of the hospital, which, bringing the charges into the account, as matter of profit, was *much better* than the hospital. Having nakedly laid open the cause to his lordship's honourable consideration, with his most humble suit in behalf of the poor hospital, he meant not to press his lordship with such reasons as the pitifulness of the cause so powerfully administered, which might be offensive to his lordship, because of his most weighty affairs; and the reasons would fall far short of those which his lordship's great wisdom would easily conceive.*

This epistle furnished the treasurer with a correct view of the painful situation in which Mr. Cartwright was placed: yet, in defiance of these glaring facts, Dr. Sutcliffe openly accused him of having accumulated riches from the hospital; but on which our divine made this brief comment: "Leases of the hospital I never

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 15.

made but one only, for which the house, and not I, received thirty pounds; and, because he draweth me to these accounts of the hospital, I will offer, and, in the hearing of any equal and indifferent auditor, will make it clear that, besides my continual travail for the settling and suits of the hospital, which I would not have undertaken for any money, but only for conscience and duty to the poor hospital, I have laid out of mine own purse forty marks over and above that which I have received, or am likely to receive, unless the stock which is holden from the house be recovered."*

While he discovered so commendable a solicitude for the welfare of this charitable institution, the poor members of the house also presented their petition to Lord Burghley, the import of which does not appear. His lordship, after the foregoing application, espoused the cause of the distressed; and to him Mr. Cartwright presented another supplication, about six weeks after the former, in which he gratefully acknowledged his lordship's generous favour, thus addressing him:—

"Her Majesty's extent upon my lord's lands, which threatened the overthrow of the hospital, through her princely hand and your lordship's singular favour, is so far from hurting, that it might have been of singular help to us, touching twenty pounds going out of Chifield, withholden by Mr. Ugnol, and the manor of Mr. Shilton, to which Mr. Cylumby now maketh claim; if the return of the commission had not been so speedy, but that we might have had time to produce witnesses for the safety of them both: wherein if your most honourable will please to grant us any further help, that the poor hospital be not driven to consume itself, in the recovery and holding of that with which it is endowed.

"As we most humbly thank your highness for the favour already showed, so I am again an humble suiter in behalf of the poor hospital, that from your good hand, whereby it now standeth, we may receive the further benefit both of the continuance and the peaceable state thereof, remembering that it will be a good work before God and praise before men, in your lordship, to continue and uphold a good work, not unlike that of our deceased lord and founder who begun it.

* Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 52.

"Touching my own particular suit, for the continuance of my annuity of fifty pounds, I would be glad that, to my common bond for your honour's favour to the hospital, I might also especially have this to bind me to you; although I confess that the benefits already received from your lordship bind me faster than I am able to unloose by any duty which I can perform in return. Thus with my most dutiful remembrance of your lordship, I recommend the same, with all your weighty affairs and whole family, to the gracious keeping and blessing of God in Jesus Christ, whom I most humbly beseech long to preserve you with all increase of piety and honour. Warwick, the fifth of August, 1590."*

The interest of the hospital excited growing solicitude in the mind of Mr. Cartwright, and he continued his untiring exertions to promote its welfare. When he addressed this epistle to the lord treasurer, he sent another "to the worshipful his loving friend" Mr. Hicks, his lordship's secretary, expressing his deep concern for the welfare of the poor hospital, and earnestly supplicating his favourable assistance with the treasurer. Mr. Cartwright had no doubt that the equity of the cause, especially that of the distressed hospital, would excite his favourable attention; and he was persuaded that it would have one more assistant to sustain and perfect that good issue, which, in equity and his lordship's honourable opinion, it justly deserved.

Mr. Cartwright heartily thanked Mr. Hicks for his past care of him and kindness to him in the time of his trouble, warmly acknowledging his generous favour shown him in that gloomy season. He feared not that he would count that out of season which was then ready to be offered; and he would not have departed before he had presented his thankfulness, if his continuance would have been as plausible to Mr. Hicks as it would have been perilous to himself. From the persuasion of his readiness to do him service, he craved his further assistance in that part of the suit which yet remained. There were two branches of his humble petition, which he had humbly stated to his lordship. As to the first, his lordship had already most honourably given order that, although the hospital lands were found, they should not be seized, but secured to the maintenance of the institution, for which his lordship of

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 17.

Leicester had granted them. The cause would also have been helped more by her Majesty's extent, had the jury been found for the Queen's Majesty, which no doubt would, if the return of the commission had not been so speedy, and sufficient time allowed to produce witnesses, as he had already particularly informed his lordship. In this behalf he had sent a close petition to his lordship that, if his honourable place might further help, he would not refuse to stretch forth his comforting hand in this cause, according as the equity of the case recommended, which he had stated to his lordship, and also now to himself.

Mr. Cartwright, as he informed Mr. Hicks, had powerful reasons to enforce the case as a matter of equity, with which he durst not trouble his lordship, but had here sent them to Mr. Hicks, desiring him, as occasion might serve, to let his lordship know them from his own mouth or otherwise, as he should find most convenient. His annuity would be in arrear one full year at Michaelmas next; and if it might not please his lordship to grant the whole, yet he would be glad to receive what portion soever his lordship pleased. Thus he testified that boldness which he wished Mr. Hicks to use towards him, in any kind of duty that his short hand might be able to afford him. So with his hearty thanks for the tokens of his past kindness, he commended him to the gracious keeping and blessing of God in Jesus Christ.*

The commendable and untiring exertions of Mr. Cartwright were not unrewarded. The cause of the afflicted hospital was triumphant; and, in a few years, its endowments were restored by order of the house of commons, and Ugnol, before mentioned, was committed to the Fleet.† The reader will here learn that the hospital at Warwick was greatly beholden to Mr. Cartwright's generous and unceasing exertions, and that those exertions were instrumental, under God, of preventing its overthrow, and of restoring to the institution its valuable possessions.

The prelatical oppressions, which continued with undiminished severity, attempted, as with a rod of iron, to force the people to attend the worship of the Established Church, and to be conformists to its ceremonial observances; but these unhallowed measures, instead of forcing the people to closer communion with the

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 18. † D'Ewes' Journal, p. 579, 581.

church, drove them farther from the ecclesiastical enclosure, and even to an entire separation. This was particularly the case with the Brownists, who were become rather numerous, both in town and country. Mr. Cartwright wrote with becoming zeal against their rigid opinions, especially their views of separation. Mrs. Stubbs, wife of the famous John Stubbs, having forsaken the church, and united with this class of Christians, sent Mr. Cartwright, who had married her husband's sister, a written defence of her opinions, to which he returned an answer, which is still preserved. This unpublished document, dated Warwick, August 30, 1590, and addressed "to Mrs. Stubbs, his sister-in-law, to persuade her from Brownism," brings under review another feature in the history of our learned puritan; for the elucidation of which it will be proper to furnish the substance of this communication, embracing the leading particulars brought under discussion:—

"Notwithstanding my business press me much, and the day of my trouble is approaching, I know not whether, if I now let it pass, I shall afterward find the opportunity to answer your letter. I would have rejoiced in the Lord's gift of memory towards you, which retains so faithfully many of the speeches which pass between us; yet my rejoicing herein is somewhat abated, fearing lest you should not bow unto the truth. Let us then come to the subject of your letter. You say that you may not communicate with us in the worship of God, because we are not the church, not being formed in obedience to the law of Christ. I answer that our obedience is imperfect, as is also our faith; and, therefore, we are not to be shut from the church for our defective obedience. You reply that our sins are presumptuous, and not of infirmity; and the church of Christ offendeth not in such sins. But who are you that judge your brethren? And why do you judge before the time, and not tarry until the day of the Lord shall open the hearts of all men? We do herein as we are persuaded out of the word of God. If we be deceived, as you say we are, yet is our sin in ignorance and infirmity, which in part cleaveth to the most perfect upon earth. Your judging us to the utter blotting of our names from the word and register of the church of God is not far from an unadvised and hasty sentence.

"Although the church ought, indeed, to be obedient to the voice

of Christ, yet it followeth not that whosoever obey not in all things the voice of Christ is not of the church. The wife ought to obey her husband; yet it followeth not, that because she obeyeth not, therefore she is no wife: so the church in this land is not unchurched, neither ceaseth to be reputed a church until the Lord taketh from her the ministry of the word, and the administration of the sacraments. You say we are fallen from the truth. Whom have we had to convince us of our apostasy and departure from God? You have, indeed, enough of those who speak against us, and denounce fearful judgments upon us: but they are not ministers sent unto us; and, if they were, yet having no reproofs in their mouths, nor arguments to confute us, their thundering by those judgments and condemnations are like headless arrows, not taken out of the Lord's quiver, but from their own sides, prick from the weak hand of their own conceit rather than from the mighty Spirit of the Lord. Either your passions or partial affections did overcome you, and cause you to forget the truth on this point, as I willingly think your own heart gave a check to your pen.

"You conclude we are not the church of Christ, seeing we have no free election of ministers. If, for this want, we be not the church of Christ, how much more are you not of that church, who have no ministers at all, and no election at all? There is not so much as one amongst you that is fit for the function of the ministry, by those necessary gifts which are required in the ministers of the word. You answer that you believe that which Christ and his apostles taught, and which you teach one another. But how came you to know the true exposition of the Scriptures, having no gift to reach unto it, nor any to teach you, or to translate them for you? There are some ministers among us who were chosen by the free voice of the people; therefore it was no reason to deny that there was any church amongst us: and it is now said that an after acceptance or liking of a minister, whom at first they did not so willingly admit, is a manifest confirmation of his ministry. The lawful acceptance of a lawful and able minister maketh his ministry lawful as if the election was free.

"The apostle recommended Timothy not to communicate with other men's sins in the election of unfit and unable ministers, giving us to understand that there might be unworthy men

ordained ministers against his voice; which could not have been done, if the election ought to have been by a full consent of the whole presbytery, much more may an election be without the consent of the whole church. If the consent of every simple person in the church be necessary to the entrance of a minister upon his charge, it is verily necessary to his continuance; so that by your choice, if any of the church shall mislike a minister, forthwith his ministry must be broken off. If the judgment of the church must pass by the voice of all, then if a person to be excommunicated have friends, who, either through ignorance or partiality, withsand the rest of the church, no separation can follow; the person himself to be excluded, being one of the church, not yielding to be cast out of the church, may still hold himself in, notwithstanding the judgment of the rest. So the church may meet with a thousand wolves to devour them ere they can meet even with one shepherd to feed them.

"We are able to say that the Lord hath opened the door of the ministry amongst us, from the singular grace and kindness, wisdom and utterance bestowed; whereby he hath set his seal unto the ministers of the word. That the sheep have heard their voice, and have rejoiced in it, is an argument that they clime not into office, but come in by the door. If you will say that the flock hear not their voice, because you fly from them, you take for the proof of your cause that which is the cause in question. You will say that all the churches of God in the world may err; to which I yield willingly. As it is possible for them all to err, so it is not possible for them all to err in the principal and fundamental points of salvation. How to know which is the true church, and which is the false; which is the spouse of Christ, and which is the strumpet; which are the children of the kingdom, and which the children of darkness, is a principal and fundamental point, wherein the churches of God cannot be deficient of the instruction and teaching of the Spirit out of the word. I also grant that the church of God on earth cannot discern the invisible church, and the company of the elect, otherwise than by the fruits of the Spirit. That you may not, therefore, join with us in the spiritual service of God is not sound, since it is a spiritual service to hear the word of God, and one of the principal services; yet a Christian may hear the word

where there are infidels and unbelievers present, and not only communicate with them in the word, but also be glad that they will so far communicate with him. If it were my choice to avoid them, I ought not to join with them; yet, having no authority or power to separate from them, I ought not to cease from the service of God which is commanded. There is no cause why I should lose the fruit of the one to avoid the infection of the other.

"Your fond reason is that the Lord being one, his people are not to be divided; some with Christ, and some not with him. As if your unity with Christ, and separation from all who are not his, were not imperfect and here only commenced, to be perfected when Christ shall make a final separation between the sheep and the goats. Or, as if they were not commanded to be suffered to continue together, when the bad cannot be separated without doing hurt to the good. And, finally, as if the presence of bodies in one place, when the disagreement of judgment is manifestly professed, doth either disunite us from our Saviour, or re-unite us to the wicked. You have not yet proved that we are the Babylonians, from whom you, the only Jews, forsooth, in the world, are bound to separate!

"I have not written this to condemn your judgment in all things you hold, nor to justify the various corruptions in our churches. There are, I confess, in the Church of England, divers things not suiting well with the security of the gospel; yet are there also those wherein you bring a wrong report of her, not as of a virgin in Israel, but as one not at all of the Israel of God, charging her with the evil which she doeth not, and taking from her the good which the Lord doeth in her. Your assemblies seek divers things which are to be desired, yet overcharged, not only in the disordered manner of seeking them, but also in the things themselves which you seek to obtain. If you had your heart's desire in those things, and should after your travail bring forth, yet would your birth, I am persuaded, have so small beauty as would draw few eyes to behold it with comfort. Nay, I doubt not that many of those who now dote upon it would, after it saw the sun, greatly distaste it, and look upon it with loathsomeness.

"Thus, sister, have I, in aim and desire to do you good, written some answer to your letter, which I protest is in persuasion from the word of God, and according to that measure of kindness which

it hath pleased the Lord to impart unto me. As I desire you would receive nothing but by the sealed measure and weight of the sanctuary, so I desire that you would not reject any thing before you have met it by the standard measure of the word. I care not who of your friends and favourers may examine my answer; yet would I crave this of you, that you may have the first reading in your chamber by yourself, lest the cause of your patience and judgment should, by some temptation, be broken off. If you remember the frailty of all mankind subject to error, then the weakness of yourself, and the small ordinary means you have had of discerning exactly the truth, it will be a good help to you of striving according to the measure of faith the Lord hath bestowed upon you. So desiring that the Lord may, indeed, open the eyes of your understanding, and bless unto you any good means to bring you into the kingdom of his dear Son, over all the hills and mountains that either the woman's frailty or the malice of Satan may cast in your way."*

The reader will make his own comments on the positions contained in this summary of extracts. Mr. Cartwright, however, did not stop here; but, having entered into this dispute, he engaged in further controversy with the Brownists: some of whose opinions he admired, but others he considered as erroneous; especially their refusing to hear the gospel, and to attend the worship of God, in the parish assemblies. To refute their rigid notions, he wrote a piece, entitled "A Reproof of Certain Schismatical Persons and their Doctrine concerning the Hearing and Preaching of the Word of God." This unpublished document is still preserved, comprising thirty-two folio pages closely written; and, as the title clearly shows, contains a discussion of the same leading topics as that addressed to Mrs. Stubbs: there is, therefore, less occasion to enlarge on the subject. It appears, from the introductory remarks, that this document was intended as an answer to a Brownist publication; and the spirit it breathes is worthy of high commendation. He commences with this honourable and unexceptionable style of address:—

"You seem to seek quietness and peace, and to prefer and call for love in debating these matters. Then give forth no cruel

* Harleian MSS. vol. 7581, art. 3.

mandate against us, and let each side stay all rash judgment and sentence till the truth be duly scanned, afterward duly offered and charitably urged; and then let the obstinate be justly reproved. If you had dealt herein according to this, and according to our request, long ago there had been more peace and love than we have, indeed, found at your hands. The Lord set our hearts and pens as sanctified means, and appointed to believe or testify his truth only. Amen."*

Mr. Cartwright's writings against the Brownists were often transcribed, and placed in "many men's hands;" and though it does not appear that the above document was ever printed, yet it is certain that he published "An Answere vnto a Letter of Master Harrisons," which, without date, was printed at Middleburgh, forming a tract of eleven closely printed pages in quarto, an abstract of which is here inserted. Through the mercy of God, Mr. Cartwright said, he hoped to profit his opponent, or to derive profit from him. He observed that the Brownists refused, without a public expression of repentance, those who came to them from the churches of England, because those churches, formed by the laws of the land, appeared to them not to be the churches of Jesus Christ; and they feared so to unite themselves as to be unequally yoked, and made fellow-members of some other body than that of which Jesus Christ was head. If then it were showed that the ordinary assemblies of those who professed the gospel in England were the churches of Christ, it seemed that the way would be paved for mutual intercourse between them. Those assemblies which had Christ for their head, and for their foundation, were, in his opinion, the churches of God, and such he considered the assemblies of England; so that, by believing in Christ's righteousness, they were made members of his body, and lively stones built upon him as upon a foundation, they grew into one spiritual building with him. The testimony of the Spirit of God, by his manifold graces poured upon them, even unto apparent sanctification, bore witness that they were members of the body of Christ, and, having his word in their hearts, they were the churches of God. The Lord in mercy had set divers burning lamps in those assemblies, whereby light was conveyed, more or less, to most

* Lambeth MSS. vol. cxiii. p. 187.

parts of the land; it therefore seemed that the church assemblies would be injured, if they were not accounted churches of Christ. While believing in the Lord Jesus, and growing up in him as one body, he could not see any appearance of fault in them to bear a minister thrust upon them; neither was it apostacy from God, nor utter falling from the gospel of Christ.

He reminded his opponent that all the churches of Christ in Europe gave their assemblies the right hand of fellowship. Though he pressed not this as an argument against separation, yet he observed that the fact ought to stay all sudden and hasty judgment to the contrary, and to allay all severe objections until the cause on both sides should be fully examined by the light of Divine truth. If it were meet to proceed cautiously in excommunicating one member from the church of God, there ought verily to be mature deliberation when all the churches in the land were to be cast out; especially when sustained by the voices, not of a few persons, but by all the churches acquainted with them. Though the parish assemblies, for want of thorough discipline and a sound teaching minister, deserved to be rejected of God, yet, being sustained by a majority in the churches themselves, they ought to be so far borne with, as communicating with them would be considered as no departure from God.

His opponent's reason for concluding that the parish assemblies had departed from God was their want of ecclesiastical discipline, from which he condemned them all of not being churches of Christ; but Mr. Cartwright pressed upon him that Christ was their foundation, and that they were built up in him, without which there could be no church; and whatsoever was wanting of that which was commanded, or remaining of that which was forbidden, did not exclude their assemblies, which had faith in Jesus Christ, from the right and title of being churches of Christ: this would utterly overthrow the truth of God. He, however, granted that there could be no church of Christ without faith in him; and that it was a part of the Saviour's discipline that certain persons should be chosen out of the rest to preach the gospel, by which souls might be converted and churches gathered. Where there was no minister of the word, there were no visible churches. It was another part of our Lord's discipline that the rest of the church should obey the

instructions of those who were set over them in the Lord; and that wheresoever obedience to the word of God was wanting, there could be no church of Christ: but where these two prevailed, though many other things were wanting, and ministers did not preach in all points as they ought, nor the assemblies in all points obey the wholesome doctrine of their teachers, yet did they retain the right and title of the churches of God. To say, therefore, that an assembly was not a church of God, because it had not received the holy discipline of Christ, was the same as to say that a place was not a city because it had no wall, or that was not a vineyard because it had no fence. But if any assembly held not Christ Jesus the head, or was only a confused multitude without any part of that order which the Son of God had appointed, it was justly cut off from being a church of the living God.

Mr. Cartwright, in conclusion, added, "Although I write in good assurance, especially in the former part touching the rightful title of the churches of Christ to be due to the assemblies in England, yet remembering, besides the common frailty of our race, special breaches and decays in myself, I shall willingly hearken unto any, much more unto you, upon whom the Lord in mercy hath bestowed good graces, showing better things. For which cause, if further conference be needful, I must through business be enforced to reserve it to conference by word of mouth. And thus, with my humble prayers unto the Lord our God for his Holy Spirit, whereby we may be able to discern things that differ, to our inoffensive walking in the sight of all men, even unto the day of the Lord, I bid you farewell."

In this epistle, as well as in that addressed to Mrs. Stubbs, while Mr. Cartwright exhibits strong opposition against separation, he shows his unalterable abhorrence of the abuses and corruptions retained in the Established Church. Brown himself engaged in this controversy, and wrote "An Answere to Master Cartwright his Letter, for joinyng with the English Churches." The original MS. is preserved, comprising forty folio pages, closely written;* but it was afterward published with this title. This piece has been ascribed to Mr. Francis Johnson. It is also recorded that Mr. Cartwright conferred with Mr. Barrow, the zealous Brownist, who

* Lambeth MSS. vol. cxiii.

declared himself to have done nothing more than push his premises to their legitimate conclusions. And it is added that Archbishop Whitgift sought to bring them to a second conference, but Mr. Cartwright refused to give his consent. No one can wonder at this refusal, since he knew too well that liberty of speech, as well as liberty of printing, was grievously prohibited; but his sentiments of the Brownist principles were already sufficiently known. Barrow, it is said, complained of Mr. Cartwright and his friends for teaching that the established ordination was antichristian, and then deserting those who fairly carried out the principle.*

The part which Mr. Cartwright took in this controversy is represented, without the slightest particle of evidence, to have told powerfully in favour of the hierarchy. His arguments bore hard on the narrow opinions of the Brownists, especially their rigid notions of separation; and he strongly pressed them to hear the gospel, and attend the worship of God, in the parish assemblies: but who, exercising impartiality and sober reflection, will conclude that this was a defence of the hierarchy, or of the severe enactments by which it was upheld? His soul revolted at the antichristian domination and unscriptural offices, with numerous other abuses, retained in the church; and he had some cause, as the reader will presently see, for not relishing either conformity, or the measures by which it was enforced. Notwithstanding these glaring facts, a modern author unhesitatingly affirms, not only that Mr. Cartwright wrote in favour of the ecclesiastical establishment, but also that he "pleaded for conformity to the church!"† This is sufficiently refuted by the foregoing extracts.

He proved himself to be a zealous advocate of purity, but not of conformity; and he considered it a duty he owed to God to use every practicable effort, consistent with the peace of the church, to advance this important object. On his former release from prison, he could not obtain a license to preach, but still continued under suspension; yet he constantly attended to his ministerial exercise in the hospital and in St. Mary's church, and he preached occasionally at Banbury and other places. These religious services were exceedingly offensive to men of severe principles and worldly ambition, who seldom or never preached, but who stigmatized them

* Soames' Elizabeth, p. 421. † Wordsworth's Biog. vol. iv. p. 365.

as innovations of ecclesiastical order, and disobedience to the laws. Mr. Cartwright, for this supposed delinquency, was summoned before the High-commission; but, previously to his appearing at this tribunal, he addressed the following letter to Serjeant Puckering:—

"Having received Mrs. Puckering's letter on Wednesday, I came no sooner with it. The cause hath been in part a strain in one of my legs, and in part the importunity of my friends, begging me to stay until I had gotton some ability of my leg to travel with more commodity. And now that I am come to town, I bring not the letter myself. The cause is that, being sent for by a pursuivant, I was loath to be attached before I made my appearance without attachment, and that I might, as it were, be mine own pursuivant; and partly, also, because I was loath that your favour towards me should any way appear to any manner of hurt of yours, and no good of mine.

"And now, good sir, confessing myself greatly beholden to you in my behalf and the behalf of my wife, my humble desire is that I may yet further be beholden to you in the behalf of the poor church at Warwick, that likely enough may be deprived of all manner of tolerable ministry, both for the good of your own family, which is great, and in regard of other poor souls there; that, if the times will not bear us who are there now, yet there may be some such provided as, differing in judgment from us, may notwithstanding, both in some good skill and care, proceed in the edification of the church, without bitterness of spirit against other poor men who are otherwise minded. This I am bolder to crave at your lordship's hands, as I understand, and was glad of, that the town hath chosen you to the recordership, which may be a singular means of doing much good to the town; and, amongst others, that good of which it pleased you to talk with me.

"This I was bold to write in fear of being severed from doing any more service there, and yet not known to myself of any breach of law whereby I may be touched; only I fear to be committed for refusing the oath *ex officio mero*. Thus I humbly commend you to the gracious keeping and blessing of God in Jesus Christ. May 20th, 1590. Your's to command in the Lord."*

Those who stood foremost in the hour of danger, who fearlessly

* Baker's MSS. vol. xv. p. 105.

engaged in the perilous warfare, and who endured the greatest amount of sufferings for the avowal of their principles, were the noblest benefactors of their species. This was the position occupied by Mr. Cartwright. His past troubles were only the beginning of sorrows, and his heaviest trials were now approaching. The gospel which he had received and honourably professed for many years inspired him with holy boldness and unyielding constancy; and its sacred principles not only expanded and elevated his mind, but also enkindled in his bosom those consolations which ensured a bounteous reward. He was undismayed with the prospect, and, having counted the cost, and exercised a holy and humble confidence in the Lord, he shrank not when the storm arrived; but, through the grace of Christ, he remained steadfast and happy, esteeming it no small honour to suffer for the sake of Christ and a good conscience.

In the month of July this year, Archbishop Whitgift sent to Lord Burghley a schedule of charges brought against certain ministers in Northamptonshire and Warwickshire, preparatory to further proceedings against them.* Though the names of these ministers do not appear, yet Mr. Cartwright, who had prepared for the coming storm, was most probably one of the number. It would have reflected no inconsiderable honour upon his grace of Canterbury, if it could have been recorded that no portion of Mr. Cartwright's sufferings were inflicted by his old adversary, especially if he had treated him with generous magnanimity. But the stern archprelate, instead of exercising lenity and kindness, followed him with resolute and overwhelming animosity; and Mr. Cartwright, presently after the above occurrence, was, by his grace's instigation, convened before the High-commission, when a train of accusations were brought against him, drawn up by Whitgift or his order, dated September 1, 1590, a summary of which is here inserted.†

That Mr. Cartwright, being a minister or deacon, according to the order of the Church of England, had forsaken and renounced those orders as antichristian and unlawful. That, having departed into a foreign land without license, and being discontented with the form of ecclesiastical government by law established, the more to testify his dislike and contempt thereof, and of the manner of his former vocation and ordination, he was contented in foreign parts,

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiii. art. 82. † Strype's Whitgift, p. 336.

at Antwerp, Middleburgh, or elsewhere, to have a new vocation or ordination by imposition of hands, in other manner and form than the laws of this realm prescribed. Let him declare upon his oath the particular circumstances thereof!

That by virtue of his latter vocation or ordination, becoming a pretended bishop or pastor of such congregations as made choice of him, he established, or procured to be established, at Antwerp, and at Middleburgh, among merchants and others, her Majesty's subjects, a certain consistory, presbytery or eldership, consisting of himself, a doctor, and seniors or elders for ecclesiastical government, and of deacons for distribution to the poor. In the said eldership, certain English-born subjects were ordained to the ministry by imposition of hands: as Hart, Travers, Grise, or some of them; and some who were ministers before, according to the orders of the Church of England, as Fenner and Axton, were so called;* and other English subjects were ordained elders, and some others were ordained deacons, in other manner and form than the laws of this realm prescribed. That such eldership, so established by Mr. Cartwright, had used admonition, suspension from the Lord's Supper, and from execution of ecclesiastical offices, with the censure of excommunication. They also claimed authority of making laws, degrees, and ecclesiastical orders, and of dealing with the doctrine and manners of all persons in the congregation, in all matters whatsoever appertaining to the conscience. And Mr. Cartwright, in his public ministry among her Majesty's subjects abroad, used not the Book of Common-prayer by law established, nor, in his ecclesiastical government, the laws and orders of this land, but conformed to the use and form of the foreign churches.

That, since his return from beyond seas, being to be placed at Warwick, he faithfully promised, if he might be tolerated to preach, not to impugn the laws, orders, government, and governors of the Church of England, but to persuade and procure to the uttermost, publicly and privately, the estimation and peace of this church. That, having no other ministry than that which he had forsaken, and still condemned as unlawful, and without any license, he had preached at Warwick, and at sundry other places. That in various private conferences with such as sought his advice, he

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 337.

had showed dislike of the ecclesiastical laws and government, and divers parts of the liturgy of the church; and had persuaded others to break the orders of the Book of Common-prayer, and to oppose the government of the church. That, in all or most of his sermons and exercises, he had taken occasion to inveigh against the bishops and other governors of this church; and had grown so far in hatred of bishops that, at sundry times, he had publicly prayed to this or the like effect: "Because they who ought to be pillars in the church do bend themselves against Christ and his truth, therefore, O Lord, give us grace and power, all as one man, to set ourselves against them."

That, at sundry times and places, he had condemned the manner of ordaining bishops, ministers, and deacons, sundry points of the ecclesiastical government, laws and orders, and the Book of Common-prayer; as, the use of the surplice, the interrogatories to the godfathers, the cross in baptism, the ring in marriage, the thanksgiving after child-birth, burials by ministers, kneeling at the communion, some points of the litany, certain collects and prayers, reading portions of Scripture for the epistle and gospel, the manner of singing in cathedrals and other churches. Having preached at the baptism of Job Throgmorton's child, he spoke in derogation of the ecclesiastical government, laws, and liturgy of this realm, and in justification of the eldership in every congregation, with conference and synods, as commanded by Christ, and as the only lawful church government.

That, by toleration, he had become so confident and implacable against the Church of England that he could not endure Mr. Bourman and others, preaching sundry times at Warwick, to speak in defence thereof; but took upon him to confute, in sundry sermons, those things which Mr. Bourman had truly and dutifully preached. In his sermons, at Warwick and elsewhere, he had delivered many frivolous, strange, and indiscreet positions; that it was requisite that the hearers of the word, who were able, should stand up during sermons. That, by his persuasions, certain persons, in and about Warwick, had impugned the orders prescribed by the Book of Common-prayer; and his own wife, by his procurement, refused, after child-birth, to give thanks in such place of the church, and in that manner which was prescribed; and some

other women, by such persuasion and example, used the same contempt. Also, at the Lord's Supper, he sate or stood, and others, influenced by his persuasion and example, did the same; and, at other times, when he communicated, both he and others, by his appointment, walked along, and received the sacrament as they passed by the minister. For these and similar disorders he had been presented to the Bishop of Worcester, before whom he spoke in justification of his doings, and offensively affirmed and disputed that the Book of Common-prayer was not established by law.

When the said Mr. Cartwright was suspended from preaching, and from every part of the ministerial function, he appealed from the said suspension, but did not prosecute within a year, whereby the cause was remitted again to the bishop; and falling again under the sentence of suspension, which was made known to him: yet, in contempt of ecclesiastical authority, he had preached at Warwick, Coventry, and elsewhere. Also, when one of his men-servants had committed fornication, and gotten a bastard, he appointed and caused the delinquent to do public penance in St. Mary's church, Warwick.

That, since his settlement at Warwick, he and others had agreed to hold, and had holden, divers public fasts, without the queen's authority, and had invited and persuaded sundry persons to be present to preach, three, four, or five in succession, all of whom were noted for disliking sundry points in the Church of England; and, in their sermons, Mr. Cartwright and others had impugned the laws, government, and liturgy of the church. And, since his abode at Warwick, he had nourished faction and heart-burning of one inhabitant against another, by distinguishing them as godly and profane.

That he knew, or had credibly heard, who were the authors, printers, or the dispercers of "Martin Mar-prelate,"* "The Demonstration of Discipline," "Diotrephes," and similar books, before it was known to authority; yet, in favour of them, and in

* The pungent, lashing pamphlet, called "Martin Mar-prelate," was principally directed against the bishops; and her Majesty's prohibition was published denouncing punishment upon all who should presume to have it in their possession: and this was stated by the queen in conversation with the Earl of Essex. "Why, then," said the earl, "what will become of me?" and, pulling the book out of his pocket, he showed it to her Majesty.—*Harleian Miscel.* vol. i. p. 219.

contempt of the laws, he made no disclosure to those in authority. And, being asked his opinion of these books, he answered that, since the bishops would not amend their practice by grave books, it was meet they should be dealt with to their shame and reproach.

That he penned, or procured to be penned, all or some part of the book of discipline; and, after it was perused by others, he recommended the same to his brethren, assembled together by his means, for that and other purposes. This book, after deliberation and certain alterations, was allowed by them to contain the only lawful church government, and fit to be put in practice; and for the accomplishment of which, the ways and means were concluded by them. Also, for the better practice of this discipline, Mr. Cartwright and others had met in assemblies, both general and particular, in the several counties of Warwick, Northampton, Oxford, Cambridge, Leicester, and other places; and it was concluded that the brethren should subscribe the said discipline, that they did allow it, would promote it, practise it, and be governed by it; and that Mr. Cartwright and many others subscribed accordingly.

That, at such meetings and other assemblies, a moderator was first chosen, according to the recommendation of such book; and it was resolved that particular conferences should be held in several counties, that a communication should be sent to the general assembly, and that one of them should make known what was to be put in practice, which course, in sundry places, had been observed accordingly. That Mr. Cartwright and others, in conference, had treated and disputed on six articles, and set down their decisions, which were afterward made known at Warwick, and allowed by the assembly; and at such conferences, many other determinations, as what should be done and what omitted, and what agreed or disagreed with the word of God, were set down by Mr. Cartwright and others.*

This train of articles, breathing the spirit of the High-commission, deserve to be transmitted to posterity as an amusing specimen of grave accusation against the persecuted ministers of Jesus Christ. Archbishop Whitgift found little difficulty in devising this long train of charges; but, admitting the whole to have been obvious and undoubted truth, they do not appear to contain any

* Fuller, b. ix. p. 198—202.

offence deserving of severe punishment. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when the birthright of conscience was so little understood, and party bigotry bore rule, no small degree of criminality was attached to the positions here enumerated; but, in latter times, all persons capable of exercising a sober judgment will consider this catalogue as containing numerous particulars worthy of high commendation. Since these articles were drawn up by the direction of Whitgift, and contain the most grievous offences that could be alleged against Mr. Cartwright, the reader here beholds his character in the most unfavourable light in which it was represented by his adversaries.

These offensive charges were exhibited against our divine, in the consistory of St. Paul's, by Bishop Aylmer and his colleagues, who required him to take the oath *ex officio* to answer them.* The lord treasurer had previously addressed a letter to the archbishop, strongly recommending him not to be present at the arraignment of Mr. Cartwright; and his grace had the circumspection to absent himself on that occasion.† Mr. Cartwright, when before the High-commission, offered on oath to clear himself of part of the charges, especially those which seemed to involve the greatest degree of criminality: but, because he deemed it contrary to the laws of God and of the realm to accuse himself or his friends, whom he considered innocent and useful men, he refused to answer the rest; and, if this would not give satisfaction to his inquisitors, he was resolved to submit to whatever punishment they might be disposed to inflict upon him.

Whitgift had displayed his powers in defence of his hierarchy; but, being promoted to the see of Canterbury, controversy formed no part of his plan of operation. He held it as a maxim that it was safer, and no doubt much easier, to silence ministers, and even to cast them into prison, than to refute their principles; and he vehemently declared that he would rather live and die in a prison than grant any indulgence to puritans!‡ With fiery zeal he united in the above proceedings, and drew up articles for the use of the High-commission, sufficient to entangle and ruin all the honest men in the kingdom. Whitgift was admirably fitted to the

* Fuller, b. ix. p. 197, 202. † Biog. Brit. vol. vii. p. 4248.
‡ Aikin's Mem. vol. ii. p. 112.

mind of Queen Elizabeth. He was no sooner raised to his high promotion than he commenced a crusade against nonconformists, which he pursued, with little interruption, to the end of his days. Presently after he became archbishop, he suspended many hundreds of the clergy for refusing subscription to a new set of articles which he was pleased to issue. The ecclesiastical commission was drawn up in terms much more severe than at any former period, which is styled "An Engine of Comprehensive Despotism;" conveying powers of inquisition and punishment, which extended to every shade of spiritual and ecclesiastical delinquency!* The archbishop's articles were drawn up in so stringent a style as to startle Lord Burghley, who, having beheld their frightful operation on pious and useful ministers, wrote to his grace, severely censuring them. "The parties," said his lordship, "are subject to condemnation before they are taught their error! I have willed them not to answer these articles, except their consciences may suffer them."† The lords of the council at the same time sent a sharp rebuke to the archbishop and Bishop Aylmer, justly exposing and condemning their antichristian severities. Their conduct could not be very honourable when their best friends so openly rebuked them!‡

In addition to the foregoing hardships, many unworthy aspersions were cast upon Mr. Cartwright: That he was concerned in the publication of "Martin Mar-prelate," was fond of dice, excessive drinking, great cruelty, and other evils of similar character. His enemies were not satisfied with propagating these untrue imputations; but, to rouse the queen's indignation, they carried these shameful reproaches to her Majesty. What could betray fouler conduct than this? But they knew this was the most easy method of effecting his ruin, and of subverting the cause which he endeavoured to promote. Placed in these painful circumstances, and expecting to be convened again before the High-commission, he laid his case before Lord Burghley, in a letter, dated October 4, 1590, protesting his entire innocence, and earnestly soliciting his lordship's favourable assistance.

In this epistle, Mr. Cartwright, having assigned his reasons for bringing his suit before his lordship rather than any other of her

* Pictoral Hist. vol. ii. p. 739, 745. † Strype's Whitgift, Appen. p. 63, 64.
‡ Fuller, b. ix. p. 151.

Majesty's most honourable privy council, reminded his lordship that, with much grief, he understood that her Majesty's heavy displeasure was against him; but in whose gracious favour, next under God, the comfort of his life and of those who depended upon him chiefly consisted. He considered himself to be under the arrest of her Majesty's High-commission for appearance on the following Thursday. What might be objected against him he knew not; but this he well knew, that from the writing of his last book, which was thirteen years before, he never wrote, nor procured any thing to be printed, which could be at all offensive to her Majesty or the state, much less had he any hand, or so much as a finger, in any of Martin Mar-prelat's publications. Although there had been divers books of Anti-Martins printed and read by all who pleased, wherein he had been not only most contemptuously derided, but also his name slanderously rent and torn in pieces, as being a dicer, as having thrust one through the leg with a knife, as loving intoxicating drink, and such evil things; whereof, he thanked God, there was not the least ground of suspicion. And he was able to prove, by sufficient witness, that, from the beginning of Martin, he had on every occasion testified his dislike and sorrow for such kind of disorderly doings. Though there had been directed to the place of his abode several persons who had made whole sermons invective against him, yet, during nearly five years, since his settlement at Warwick, he had as sparingly spoken on any matter of controversy as any person whatsoever being of his judgment. His most humble suit, therefore, was, that it would please his lordship, either by counsel or favour, or both, which God had most plentifully bestowed upon his lordship, to afford him relief against the troubles that were coming upon him, especially against her Majesty's displeasure, which he was anxious to redeem with any earthly commodity, how dear soever it might be. So with humble acknowledgment of his duty to his lordship, he commended him, with all that belonged unto him, to the gracious blessing of God, for all increase of piety and long life, with honour unto the end.*

Notwithstanding the decisive tone of this letter, especially in expressing his "dislike and sorrow" at the writings of Martin

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 20.

Mar-prelate, a modern accuser, in the absence of all sound evidence, not only classes our divine with the Martinists, and gravely states that his "new doctrines" were "echoed in their clamour," styling them "Revolutionists," but also boldly declares that "Mr. Cartwright approved of these libels, and well knew the concealed writers, who, indeed, frequently consulted him!" This author, by the perversion of facts, must have been governed by some wrong propensity; and, since he could have very little concern for his own reputation, he could hardly expect his statements to be credited. He, nevertheless, adds that our puritan, being asked his opinion of such books, observed that some books must be earnest, and some mild and temperate, by which they may be of the spirit of both Elias and Eliseus.* In this extract the author evidently means his reader to believe two things, both of which are untrue. The allusion to Elias and Eliseus is given as that of Mr. Cartwright, whereas it is a part of an article adopted by a synod of his brethren. It is also made to refer to the Mar-prelate publications, while, in fact, it has no connexion with them, but relates simply to a sort of censorship which the members of the synod adopted among themselves.†

It is true that Mr. Cartwright was charged with having uttered certain expressions imputed to him, or rather, in the uncertain phrase of his accusers, with having uttered something to that "effect" or "tending that way;" but, while he refused to profess an unqualified disapprobation of satirical writing on religious subjects, his affirmation, as we have stated, was that he could produce witnesses to prove the "misliking and grief" which he expressed the first time that he ever heard of "Martin Mar-prelate."‡ This author seems, however, not inclined to believe Mr. Cartwright on this point, and his struggle to avoid doing so exhibits a singular mixture of craft and weakness. And the author before cited declines informing his reader that such disclaimer was uttered by Mr. Cartwright, or, at least, has deemed it sufficient to affirm "that Mr. Cartwright approved of these libels!" Dr. Sutcliffe having asked our divine when he would condemn the writings of Martin Mar-prelate, Mr. Cartwright replied, "I ask again, what

* D'Israeli's Charles, vol. iii. p. 241, 245.

† Vaughan's Stuarts, vol. i. p. 268.

‡ Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 48.

office I have to publish condemnation upon every unlawful and uncivil writing that cometh abroad? and yet I have a witness that, even publicly, when I was allowed to preach, I condemned all dealing in that kind." To establish his loyalty and allegiance, he declared that he had sworn five or six times to her Majesty's supremacy; and that, if any one suspected a change of his judgment, he was ready to take the oath again.*

It is recorded that a meeting of ministers was held in London, when it was debated whether Mr. Cartwright should discover all or any of the matters which had passed at their former religious assemblies.†

Mr. Cartwright had the most gloomy prospects: but he showed becoming anxiety, being conscious of his innocence, to have his case thoroughly sifted and examined; and for this purpose he made earnest application to those in power. At this crisis he addressed a letter to the Lord Chancellor Hatton, without date, in which he humbly solicited his honourable indulgence and assistance, in his distressing circumstances, thus addressing his lordship:—

"Your honour's love to the doctrine of the gospel, with hatred of former power and popery, whereof I have conceived an opinion, by report of some persons of right good credit, (your service proceeding wherein I beseech God to make you truly and perfectly honourable,) hath put my pen in my hand to write unto you, for obtaining some of that grace, of which you have so great a store with her Majesty, to my special relief in a cause, the equity whereof I leave to your honour's judgment, after it shall please you to inform yourself of the same. Seeing all godly truth is so near of kin one to the other as no sisterly bond is to be compared therewith, the door of your harbour being open to the one, I trust shall not be closed against the other. Having here laid open the principal ground of my encouragement, there came to my mind, for my better confirmation therein, that, if it be of honourable report to do good to many, it is much more that your goodness should light upon those who are trodden underneath their feet; which is so much the more acceptable to God, as he hath more especially commended the care of those than of any others, and so much the

* Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 38, 48. † Harleian MSS. vol. 6849, p. 254.

more welcome unto men, as every one hath a nearer sense and greater gladness of his change from a troublesome estate unto a quiet than from a quiet into more commotion.

"My trouble, if it please your honour, is not only the restraining of my liberty these five years, [meaning his long suspension,] but especially as that which hath much heaviness upon me, the suspicion of my loyalty, whereof I stand accused to her Majesty. The matter is this: First, I do with most humble thanks, chiefly unto the Lord our God, and then to her Majesty, which is God's good hand towards us, acknowledge the estimable treasure of the doctrine of the gospel, which shineth amongst us. Then I cannot deny that I have written some things which run into the evil speeches of divers persons, otherwise well-disposed, the cause whereof is the clamours and unconscionable reports of persons who love themselves too much, who have learned too well this point of husbandry to some of their slanderous speeches threefold, to the end that some at least may take effect. I am charged with things which not only I did never write, but which never so much as entered into my thoughts; as to make an attempt against all good government in the commonwealth, to mislike magistrates, and especially monarchy, to like equality of all estates, and a headless ruling of the unruly multitude. In the church, to persuade the same disservice of making no difference between the people and their governors: in their governors, to leave no degrees. To give to ministers, in their sundry charges, an absolute power of doing what they like best, without control of either civil or ecclesiastical authority; and, as to the present state of our church, that I have such an opinion of it as, in the mislike thereof, I persuade the ministers from their charges, and the people from hearing the word and receiving the sacraments at their hands, unless it might be in such sort as I myself would have it. All which judgment, I utterly detest; so, for the maintenance of them, there shall not be found, without open and violent wresting, so much as one sentence in any of my books that have been published: whereas, on the contrary, there are divers sentences of that clearness which none can deny, but he who will say that it is not light at noon-day.

"If happily your honour will inquire after proof, it cannot be more certainly had than from my books written in this behalf. If

that may seem too long, let the trial be the ecclesiastical discipline written in the latter, which, as it handleth the same matter, so, by the preface set before it, I have testified my agreement therewith. If yet a shorter way be sought, the prefaces in my several books, containing the sum of the matter in demand, will answer for my dutiful meaning in these causes. If any other more reasonable way may be advised, I will thereunto most willingly submit myself. Only my humble suit is that I may not be condemned in silence; but there may be a time of trial, as there has been of accusation. Her Majesty hath a care open to her poorest subjects. I am one of that number, in humble submission with the poorest in affectionate good-will towards her long reign, and heaped felicity with the richest; as that which I have daily most humbly commended unto the Lord, from the first time that ever I had any feeling knowledge of the gospel until this present time. Whosoever have received at her Majesty's hands, when their goods are only touched; but my name, which is much more precious than such possessions, is rent asunder. Their causes concern only themselves: mine reacheth unto many and divers persons. Theirs is in earthly matters: mine is in heavenly. Being, therefore, in dutiful allegiance equal with others, my humble suit is that, in indifferent hearing and information of the cause, I may not be inferior unto them.

"I desire nothing more than that the cause itself, so far as it shall be proved good, might so appear unto her Majesty. My next desire is that, if I must needs remain in her highness' suspicion, the grievous sorrow whereof I shall not lay down but with my life, yet that it may be according to that which I have written, and not according to that which is reported of me. So shall I be sure to be eased of the slanderous surmise of my disloyalty to her Majesty's estate and to the commonwealth; likewise of my love to puritanism and church confusion, the contrary of which I do most earnestly protest, with this offer, that, if either be proved against me, I will refuse no extremity to be practised upon me. This is my humble suit, wherein, whatsoever your honour shall bring to pass, you shall not have me alone, but numbers of others favouring the truth bound unto you. And thus I humbly commend you to the Lord's gracious keeping, whom

I beseech daily to increase in you all godliness and honour to his glory. Your honour's most humbly to command."*

We have not been able to learn what impression this epistle produced in the mind of his lordship; but certain it is that Mr. Cartwright obtained no relief, since he was, by the High-commission, committed prisoner to the Fleet. When he protested against the "love of puritanism and church confusion," he could not mean that he had relinquished his principles of reform, as will presently be manifest; and he doubtless intended the practice of separation, and the irregular proceedings of Brownism, which he not only deemed confusion, but also constantly opposed. Mr. Cartwright, in his painful circumstances, had frequent epistolary communications with the lord treasurer; and in one of his letters he complained of being deprived of his hospital, without the least prospect of being restored, by which his maintenance of himself and family sustained great injury. He was not only torn from his flock and deprived of his benefit, but was also committed to prison, and the hospital left utterly destitute of ministerial instruction, to the unspeakable grief of good men, the triumph of papists, and the exultation of those who made a mock of religion.† How lamentable was it, not to say how insulting to God, that so distinguished a divine was cast aside as useless, and his flock deprived of his valuable services, without a successor to supply his place! Who were the authors of these indignities and oppressions? Those who are unacquainted with these transactions will be surprised to learn that the right reverend prelates and their colleagues, who ought to have been examples of piety and humanity, "showing all meekness unto all men," were the perpetrators of these unhallowed deeds! That which most deeply affected Mr. Cartwright was the sorrowful message which he received from the treasurer, concerning her Majesty's heavy displeasure against him; the print of which, entering into his heart, would there remain until he should be restored to the ordinary favour of other worthy subjects. His low estate greatly discomforted him, seeing he could not appease her Majesty's anger, for want of an eye to see the best way; and, if he saw it, yet had he no foot to approach so great a personage.

Under a conseiousness of his inability to accomplish these ob-

* Upcott's MSS. p. 32. † Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 22.

jects, he humbly and importunately entreated his lordship to be his good lord to sooth the queen's anger, and regain her favour. With the view of obtaining so great and necessary a comfort, the case of Job had come into his mind, who cleared himself against the accusations of his friends; and he declared that his lordship was eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame; and he despaired not that his cause, being destitute and forsaken, would, by his lordship's ability, obtain help; and he wished it were the will of God that, from the same mouth from which he had received the wound, he might also receive the salve and the remedy. His lordship knew that, by dealing in former controversy, his ministry was still more subject to the lash of time than that of many others. He, therefore, earnestly prayed unto the Lord that her Majesty, and other great personages about her, might be sparing in the credit they gave to those accusations which were offered against him; without which, it was not possible for him to remain in the favour of those by whom it most concerned him to be well-esteemed.

No man is placed beyond the reach of slanderous and false accusation, even in the best of times; but how difficult was it to escape this evil in the oppressive reign of Queen Elizabeth! Mr. Cartwright could appeal to his lordship, as well as to his own heart, in proof of his fidelity and innocence. He further complained to his lordship of the mischievous devices of his enemies, who, to destroy his reputation, and even to take away his life, reproached and falsely accused him to those in power. His lordship was well acquainted with the shameful surmises and reproaches of one Rodham, having had the sifting of the matter; and he doubted not that his lordship had ascertained that there was not the shadow of truth in his accusations, being the man whom, to his knowledge, he never saw. He could mention other pratlers and ill-disposed persons who sought, partly to take away his life, and partly his poor name; each of which ought to be protected, if not for his sake, yet for the sake of the gospel, whereof he had been a minister many years.

He, moreover, reminded his lordship that, if their accusations were true, it was not marvellous that her Majesty was highly displeased with him, being those for which he should be unworthy to live. But, being strictly examined, which he humbly desired,

if there should appear a single speck, or even the least smoke, of those things which were surmised, he wished to have the uttermost that justice could inflict upon him. These accusers no doubt took encouragement from his disgrace in the eyes of her Majesty and others, concluding that they might practise, unpunished, whatsoever their malice devised against him.

Mr. Cartwright was placed in a peculiar situation. For having engaged in controversy with Dr. Whitgift, and his other attempts to promote ecclesiastical reform, he had incurred the displeasure of those in power; and this gave an uncontrollable license to the tongues and pens of his enemies, which served further to incense his superiors against him. He, nevertheless, openly protested and decisively proved his loyalty to the queen, and his obedience to the government of his country. He could appeal to his own heart, touching his most humble and dutiful obedience; he should rejoice to have the whole searched and sifted to the bottom; and he was certain that no man could condemn him, when his daily actions, as in the light of the gospel, were offered to be read of all men. He admitted that he was not a proper witness in his own cause, especially as the unfavourable testimony of his enemies was against him; yet he assured his lordship that there were those who could and would bear witness of his dutiful and peaceable conduct in the whole course of his ministry.

He observed that he had already informed his lordship, and he again testified, that he possessed no earthly commodity which he would not willingly sacrifice to redeem her Majesty's favour. If the resignation of his place in the hospital might effect this, notwithstanding he had patent of it for life, and it was the principal means for the maintenance of himself, his wife, and five small children; yet, if his being there, as his lordship had informed him, was offensive to her Majesty, he, to obtain her Majesty's gracious favour, should be content to surrender it, to be bestowed upon some other more agreeable to her Majesty, and to retire into any corner of her Majesty's dominions which she might be pleased to appoint.

This distressed sufferer pleaded his cause, and vindicated his innocence against the imputations heaped upon him; and, having declared his readiness to sacrifice his legal benefice and retire into

any other part of the kingdom, with a view to regain her Majesty's favour, he approached his lordship as a principal magistrate, who, as he had to promote the interest of the prince for the advantage of the people, so, if he might enjoy so great a favour, it should be a bond to unite him to her Majesty in the duties which might possibly devolve upon him; but if not, it remained, to the trouble of old age, which was a burden sufficient of itself, that he must also go heavily under the charge of her Majesty's displeasure. With humble prayer to God for his lordship's continuance, with increase of all piety and goodness, he closed both his epistle and his suit, which, being laid before his lordship, he saw not what more he could do, but only to wait the issue which it might please the Lord to afford. London, the twelfth of October, 1590.*

The lord treasurer, a known enemy to oppression, was a rare example of Christian moderation and genuine philanthropy. Though he did not espouse Mr. Cartwright's opinions, nor encourage any deviation from established order, yet he was confidently certain that the measures adopted by the prelates were not only severe and unjust, but also likely to do incalculable mischief; his lordship, therefore, having received this supplication, addressed the following epistle to Archbishop Whitgift:—

"It may please your grace to accept these few lines as I mean them, without interpretation of my letter to any other sense than more to respect your grace than the party for whom I write. Your grace remembereth of late that, if Mr. Cartwright, for whom I now write, were to be convened for any misorder in causes of religion, that he might rather appear before some other of the commissioners; and that I assure your grace, I moved not for any respect of him, but of your grace, as I perceived your grace did therein allow my motion. But now I pray your grace, even in respect of public opinions, let him not be charged with *old causes*, wherein I think he is taught to make amends. Your grace knoweth an old true sentence: 'He that believeth every thing is endowed with a great mind, but especially he that will sacrifice every thing.'

"But because he constantly affirmeth to me that he hath given no cause of late years to be charged with any disorder in his

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 21.

preaching or readings, I am of opinion that it were not good in charity, nor edification, to have him *too far strained upon any old charges*. Your grace must not think that I am carried with any particular respect for this man, or for any, to comfort them in walking disorderly; yet I pray your grace to bear with my conceit. I see not that diligence or care taken to win these kind of men, that are prescribed either by learning or courtesy, as I imagine might reclaim them. I send your grace certain articles, whereto the King of Scots hath required his new clergy to subscribe, to which I think they will assent. From my house at Westminster, the fourteenth of October, 1590. Your grace's at command."*

It does not appear what effect this admonitory letter had on the mind of Archbishop Whitgift; only, as Mr. Cartwright was twice arraigned before the High-commission and committed to the Fleet during this month, it must have failed to make any favourable impression. We are gravely told that Mr. Cartwright was committed to prison for printing, without license, his Answer to the Rhemish Testament, as well as for other offences;† whereas, the fact is, as already stated, that publication was not printed till many years after his death! Although his grace of Canterbury was not present at Mr. Cartwright's commitment, yet his absence was only for the sake of decency, and to prevent the clamours of the world; but his servants, as in fact all the commissioners were, knew sufficiently what were his sentiments, and could execute his pleasure equally in his absence as in his presence. Our learned divine, under these disgraceful severities, made fresh application to Lord Burghley, who, from a tender concern for his injured and oppressed suppliant, addressed another admonitory letter to Whitgift.‡ These documents, it is regretted, are not preserved; and so it is impossible to favour the reader with the gratification which a perusal would no doubt have afforded.

Mr. Cartwright, however, at the request of Lord Burghley, sent his lordship a brief but circumstantial account of these proceedings; and his lordship knew as well as any man what advice to give, and he so far espoused his cause as to afford his wise counsel how to act at this painful juncture, for which the prisoner

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. ciii. art. 71. † Biog. Brit. vol. vii. p. 4243.
‡ Strype's Whitgift, p. 337.

expressed unfeigned thankfulness. Seeing his lordship, of his honourable favour, yielded him that which his great and manifold affairs might have denied, so his lordship recommended him to nullify the proceedings against him. With humble and thankful remembrance of his lordship's letter to the archbishop in his behalf, he felt bound to use the same favour which it pleased his lordship to grant to others, that he might obtain that relief which his lordship in wisdom and equity should think meet; and that the truth being known, he might not, through contrary rumours, be more deeply charged than the case justly deserved.

He then reminded the worthy statesman that, having been offered an indefinite oath, to answer whatsoever should be demanded of him, he considered it as contrary to the laws of God and of the land to require such an oath, especially of a minister of Christ, and being the person accused. Having furnished his lordship with the heads of a great number of accusations, he observed that he was not bound by any law to take an oath to answer all these inquiries; yet, because he perceived some of the charges to be criminal, from all suspicion of which he was willing to acquit his ministry, and to clear himself from the jealousy of the magistrates, especially of her Majesty. He should also be content, if no other proof would suffice, to take an oath to acquit himself of the charges, that he had given up his former ministry and taken another, that he ordained ministers, held conventicles, called synods, and other similar charges; provided that he might have a copy of the articles, be allowed the advice of counsel, and have time for deliberation to furnish his answers. His accusers having charged him with publishing libels, he said that, "Martin Mar-prelate" excepted, he esteemed some of those books dutifully and learnedly written, which they might call libels: yet, because he had professed to his lordship that he had not the least share in those publications, lest it should be suspected that he had laid down any untruths in his letter to his lordship, he signified that he was ready and willing to answer this also; but he would never answer upon his oath to the injury of others, who would not themselves answer upon oath. If there were any of the articles which he declined to answer on his oath, he offered to assign his reasons for refusing; but, if this would not give satisfaction, he would,

as already stated, submit to that punishment which they might award. He concluded by declaring that this was the sum of what passed at both sittings of the High-commission, which was more circumstantially detailed in a discourse he had prepared, if his lordship would be pleased to see the subject more largely unfolded. He added, "I commend the cause to your honour, and yourself to the gracious direction, preservation, and blessing of God, whom I most humbly beseech to add, with much honour, much grace unto your life, for the establishment of piety, health and peace amongst us to posterity. From the Fleet, the fourth of November, 1590. Your honour's most humbly to command."*

The proposals which he offered, how equitable soever they were, gave no satisfaction to the High-commissioners, who, being resolved to make him feel their power, re-committed him to the Fleet, where, for a long time, he endured the rigours of close and miserable confinement. While suffering these extremities from the guardians of the church, who ought certainly to have known better, he cherished the deepest sympathy for his beloved people at Warwick, to which he frequently adverted in his correspondence with Lord Burghley. He must have felt the ponderous weight of these hardships. Torn from his beloved flock, for whom he had so strong an affection, he could not be supposed to forget himself. His condition was peculiarly painful. Affliction was added to his bonds; and, for the trial of his faith and patience, he long groaned under the gout and stone, which greatly increased by lying in close, unhealthy prisons. One of his children was at the same time snatched away by death. His path was beset with briers and thorns; but he endured "as seeing him who is invisible;" and, trusting in the Lord, he endeavoured to obtain some mitigation of suffering by presenting humble petitions to those in power. He presented one petition to a member of the High-commission, to be communicated to the rest, that he might be released on bail, giving sufficient security for his appearance when called; also two others of similar import he sent to the two lord chief justices, from each of whom he received favourable answers. This he made known in a *fourth* petition to Lord Burghley.

In this document he observed that the cause of every man, how-

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 22.

ever mean his calling, obtained his lordship's hearing; so he was persuaded that his suit, who had been a minister of the gospel about thirty years of her Majesty's gracious reign, would obtain his lordship's careful attention. If others found access for decay of their outward estates, he trusted that he should not be denied, especially as his health was so greatly impaired by the hardships of the prison. He wished his lordship to understand that, for the space of eighteen weeks in an unhealthy prison, he had waited to see what the honourable and worshipful her Majesty's High-commissioners would do with him; but, seeing nothing was likely to be done, at the soonest, before the next term, and seeing, besides age, the gout and stone were both growing fast upon him, and the season was so favourable, he was constrained, under these rigours, to seek his lordship's relief. For this purpose he had solicited her Majesty's High-commissioners that he might be clearly discharged, upon sufficient surety, to appear when and where it should please them to appoint; and that he might return home, since it had lately pleased God to take away one of his children by death. But if that could not be obtained, yet he implored their lawful favour of being placed in some friend's house in or near the city, with such proper limitation as would secure him the comfortable exercises of religion, with such freedom and change of air as would conveniently suit the enfeebled state of his health. From them he received an answer, also from the two lord chief justices, to whom he had applied, that they were ready to yield to his suit, only they could not conveniently release that whereunto some of her Majesty's privy council had been made privy without their consent.

His most humble supplication, therefore, to his lordship was to obtain his honour's favour and furtherance of his humble suit for bail, in such sort as to his lordship's wisdom should seem most convenient; and that, if his best way was by supplication to the whole board of her Majesty's privy council, in which he most humbly desired his lordship's wise direction, it would please his honour to suffer him to be further indebted to his lordship for such assistance in this suit as he found the last time he made similar application to him. He concluded by expressing his dutiful remembrance of his lordship's favour towards him at all times, com-

mending him, with all his weighty affairs, to the gracious direction and blessing of God in Christ Jesus.*

Mr. Cartwright, notwithstanding his heart-stirring entreaties, obtained no redress, but still continued in close and miserable confinement. Had he been guilty of some flagrant offence, or if his persecutors, who sought his ruin, had been able to allege against him the least degree of criminality, there would have been some extenuation of these enormities; but, seeing he was exempt from all such charges, except from the clamour of the wicked, the mild and amiable voice of equity and truth would have said, "Unlock the prison-doors, and let him go." When it is further recollected that rebellious papists and other criminals were released on bail, it appeared extremely hard that a scholar, a protestant, a minister of Jesus Christ, should meet with treatment so much opposed to the principles of justice, and to the claims of truth and humanity! It was Mr. Cartwright's misfortune to fall into the hands of those whose tender mercy was cruelty.

Many of the suffering puritans, who were silenced and deprived, presented, at this period, an affecting petition to the house of commons, in which they declared, It pierced their hearts with grief to hear the cries of the people for the word of God. The bishops either preached not at all, or very seldom; and others abandoned their flocks, contrary to the charge of Christ, *Feed my sheep.* But great numbers of the best qualified ministers, and the most industrious in their spiritual function, were not suffered quietly to discharge their duties to God, but followed with innumerable vexations, being neither heretics nor schismatics. They fasted and prayed for the queen and the church, though they were rebuked for it, and punished by civil and ecclesiastical officers. They were suspended and deprived of their ministry, and their livings sequestered to others; and many of them were committed to prison, when some were chained with *irons,* and continued in durance a long time. The bishops tendered to suspected persons the oath *ex officio,* to answer all interrogatories put to them, though it were to accuse themselves; and when they had obtained a confession, they proceeded upon it to punish them with all rigour, contrary to the laws

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxvi. art. 48.

of God and the land. The grounds of these troubles were not impiety, immorality, or want of learning or diligence in their ministry, but not being satisfied in the use of certain ceremonies and orders derived from the Church of Rome, and not being able to declare "that every thing in the Book of Common-prayer was according to the word of God."*

It is not certain that Mr. Cartwright was concerned in this petition; but it is insinuated, without the shadow of evidence, that his refusal of the odious oath was the effect of advice from some person of influence.† As the administration of this oath was the occasion of incalculable mischief to multitudes of her Majesty's worthy subjects, it will be necessary to furnish some account of its operation. The most satisfactory way of doing this will be by stating the sentiments of those who witnessed the circumstances of its administration, and its influence on the rights and liberties of the people.

The Lord Treasurer Burghley, in one of his letters to Archbishop Whitgift, said, "I have read over your *twenty-four* articles, of great length and curiosity, formed in a *Romish* style, to examine all manner of ministers without distinction, and to be executed *ex officio mero*. I find these articles so curiously penned, so full of branches and circumstances, that I think the *Inquisition of Spain* used not so many questions to comprehend and entrap their prey! I know your canonists can defend these, with all their particles. But surely, under your grace's correction, this judicial and canonical sifting of poor ministers is not to edify and reform. And in charity I think they ought not to answer all these nice points, except they were very notorious offenders in papistry or heresy. Now, my good lord, bear with my scribbling: I write with the testimony of a good conscience: I desire the peace of the church. I desire concord and unity in the exercise of our religion: I favour no sensual and wilful recusant; but I conclude that, according to my simple judgment, this kind of proceeding is too much savouring of the *Romish Inquisition*, and is a device to *seek* for offenders rather than to *reform* any!"‡

His grace of Canterbury, to whom this pointed admonition was addressed, was not quite easy under the mild castigation of so great a personage; and, to convince the lord treasurer of his errors,

* MS. Regis. p. 672. † Strype's Whitgift, p. 339. ‡ Fuller, b. ix. p. 155.

his grace sent him two papers: one containing reasons why ministers ought to be examined upon their oaths; the other showing the inconvenience of proceeding against them by presentment and witnesses! The reader is here furnished with a summary of the latter paper, showing in the clearest light the basis of these persecuting measures. If witnesses were required to be produced, said the archbishop, it would furnish a precedent for papists, Brownists, and all other sectaries, to expect the *same favour*, and to be convinced only by witnesses upon presentment! But, by the process adopted, a person suspected was put to his trial, and required to answer articles upon his oath, since no witness could be obtained in proof of his offence! If the chief gentlemen, or a majority of the parish, were so affected, nothing could be presented. This would, moreover, occasion great trouble of writing so many commissions for charging and examining witnesses, and would be attended with great expense, with the trouble of procuring commissioners and witnesses in the country, and the charges of them, with the transmission of the depositions. If archbishops and bishops were forced to use proofs by witnesses, the execution of the law would be unequal; and, if they were compelled to produce witnesses for every charge, they would be overpressed with expenses!*

These reasons the famed Archbishop Whitgift assigned for proceeding against suspected persons by the infamous oath *ex officio*, causing men to accuse themselves and their friends, without the formality of indictment, and even without the use of jury and witnesses, considered of so much importance in courts of justice. It was unnecessary that a person should be learned in the law to discover the gross violation of law, as well as of Scripture, by prosecutions according to this odious scheme; by which a suspected person was to be acted upon, and sifted till evidence could be forced from his mouth, not in open court, and before a judge of the realm, but in secret consistory, and before a number of self-interested ecclesiastics, who claimed the power of *witnesses, jurors*, and *judges!* By such method of prosecution, especially when in the hands of persons without bowels of mercy, a man, guilty or not guilty, must be ruined; and it was before this tribunal that

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 161—163.

Mr. Cartwright refused this unnatural oath, so disgraceful to the annals of the Church of England!

But Lord Burghley, the friend of humanity, did not stop here. On this painful subject, he ventured to give advice to her Majesty. Having disclaimed all participation in the preciseness of the puritans, he said, "I am provoked to lay at your highness's feet my opinion touching the preciser sort; and I am bold to think the bishops, in these dangerous times, take a very ill and unadvised course in driving them from their cures, for two reasons. First, because it discredits the reputation and estimation of your power, when foreign princes know that, amongst your protestant subjects, in whom consists your strength and power, there is so great a heart-burning and division; and, secondly, because, though they are over-squeamish and nice in their opinions, and more scrupulous than they need, yet, with their careful catechising, and diligent preaching, they bring forth the fruit of diminishing the papistical numbers."*

Historical records furnish the prominent fact that ecclesiastical persons, having obtained a fastness in the establishment, have, with few exceptions, opposed reformation. But why have they manifested this opposition? It cannot be supposed that this arose from their superior attainments in piety, or their ardent solicitude for the glory of God and the welfare of souls. The intelligent reader is aware that the opposition to ecclesiastical reform was the spontaneous fruit of educational partiality, or the attraction of worldly interest, or the love of domination, or the prevalence of spurious religion, or several or all these combined, which the system could not fail to generate.

Of the learned counsellers whom Mr. Cartwright and his brethren were supposed to have consulted was Mr. James Morrice, of great celebrity. This learned person wrote a treatise against this oppressive oath, which he presented for examination to Lord Burghley; but which he refused to publish, "lest any offence should be taken." He, nevertheless, considered it a duty he owed to God and man to show "the iniquity of these proceedings, which were repugnant to the law of God, and injurious to the subjects of the realm!"† He showed that the proceeding *ex officio*, and urging the oath, was against the word of God and the law of

* Harleian Miscel. vol. vii. p. 58. † Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxxxii. art. 69.

nature.—That it was never allowed by any general or particular council, or any canon of the church, or any ancient father, for the space of a thousand years after Christ.—That this method of proceeding, originally brought into use during the ten heathen persecutions, was founded in injustice, and that it was countermanded by some of the pagan, persecuting emperors.—That it was against the pope's law in the decretals, which employed this inquisition only in the case of heresy, and when the accuser was in danger, and not otherwise.—That such jurisdiction, he added, was against the laws, liberties, and customs of the realm, and against her Majesty's prerogative!*

The reader, by comparing the powers of the High-commission with that of the Inquisition, will find that the principal difference between the two courts consisted in their names; the one being a protestant, the other a popish court. Notwithstanding this, Mr. Hooker severely censures the puritans for refusing the oath *ex officio;* and he adds that this occasioned "most just cause of fear, lest our hastiness to embrace a thing of so perilous consequence should cause posterity to feel those evils, which are more easy for us to prevent than they would be for them to remedy!"† Men sometimes attempt to defend that which is indefensible, and so injure their own reputation.

This oath, justly denominated "the torture of conscience," was abused to most grievous tyranny and oppression. Archbishop Whitgift procured of the queen a new ecclesiastical commission, whose jurisdiction, even according to Hume, extended over the whole kingdom, and over all orders of men; and every circumstance of its authority, and all its methods of proceeding, were contrary to the clearest principles of law and natural equity. The commissioners were empowered to visit and reform all errors, heresies, schisms, and to regulate all opinions, as well as to punish all breaches of uniformity in the exercise of public worship. They were directed to make inquiry by all the ways and means which they could devise; that is, by the rack, by torture, by inquisition, by imprisonment. Where they found reason to suspect any person, they might administer to him an oath, called *ex officio,* by which he was bound to answer all questions, so as to accuse himself or his most intimate friends. The fines were *discretionary,*

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 340. † Hooker's Eccl. Polity, vol. i. p. 63, 64.

and often occasioned the total ruin of the offender, contrary to the established laws of the kingdom. The imprisonment to which they condemned any delinquent was limited by no rule but their own pleasure. They assumed the power of imposing on the clergy what new articles of subscription, and what doctrines of faith, they thought proper. The ecclesiastical commissioners, moreover, were exempted from the inhibition of the superior courts, and were liable to no control. This court, Hume adds, was a real *inquisition,* attended with all the iniquities inseparable from that tribunal!*

* Hume's Hist. vol. v. p. 262, 263.

CHAPTER IX.

ARRAIGNED BEFORE THE HIGH-COMMISSION AND THE STAR CHAMBER.

The subject of this memoir endured extreme hardships in prison; but he was not alone in these disgraceful inflictions. Many other divines, reputable for learning and piety, were his companions in tribulation; and, since their history is intermixed, it will be necessary to furnish a summary of the whole. Archbishop Whitgift discovered assiduous concern for the welfare of the church by the adoption of decisive measures against the reforming puritans. The author who furnishes this information ought to have distinctly stated that these puritanical Reformers did not attempt to accomplish their object by the use of compulsory force, but in the most peaceable manner, following the instructions of the word of God. When, therefore, he affirms that they endeavoured to *subvert* the Church of England, and set up another kind of church government, *without* the leave or knowledge of the rulers, he ceases to sustain the character of an impartial writer. This would lead the unwary reader to conclude that the puritan Reformers had devised some seditious or treasonable design to destroy the Established Church. On the slightest impartial inquiry all this alarm and danger vanishes like smoke; and no fact can be more obvious than that they sought, by the most honourable and peaceable addresses to those in power, to have the church rescued from existing corruptions, and to obtain a reformation in obedience to the authoritative instructions of the gospel. Where then was their criminality?*

Many learned divines who engaged in these praiseworthy efforts

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 327.

were convened before the High-commission, and required on oath to answer numerous articles of inquisition, which a number of them absolutely refused. Their studies were broken open by force, and their private papers carried away, from which those articles were professedly collected relating principally to their religious associations, subscription to the book of discipline, and their putting it in practice. Archbishop Whitgift informed the lord treasurer that they refused to answer the charges brought against them; adding that "it was manifest, from written letters and other writings found in their houses, that they were culpable."* Among the papers that were seized and produced in evidence against them was the following declaration, subscribed by Mr. Cartwright and eleven learned divines:—

"The brethren, assembled together in the name of God, have heard and examined by the word of God, and according to their best abilities and judgments, a draught of discipline, essential and necessary for all times, and have thought good to testify concerning it as follows: 'We acknowledge and confess the same to be agreeable to God's most holy word, so far as we are able to judge, excepting some points, which we have sent to our reverend brethren of this assembly for their further consideration.'

"We affirm it to be the same which we desire to be established in this church, by daily prayer to God, which we promise, as God shall offer opportunity and give us to discern it so expedient, by humble suit unto her Majesty, her honourable council, and the parliament, and by all other lawful and convenient means, to further and advance, so far as the laws and peace of the present state of our church will suffer it, and not enforce the contrary. We promise to guide ourselves, and to be guided by it, and according to it. For a more special declaration of some points more important and necessary, we promise uniformly to follow such order, when we preach the word of God, as in the book is by us set down, in the chapters of the office of ministers of the word, of preaching, of sermons, of sacraments, of baptisms, and of the Lord's Supper.

"Further also, we follow the order set down in the chapters of the meetings, as far as it concerneth the ministers of the word. For which purpose, we promise to meet together every six weeks

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiii. art. 32.

in classical conferences, with such of the brethren here assembled, as for their neighbourhood may fit us best, and such others as, by their advice, we shall desire to be joined with us. The like we promise for provincial meetings every half year from our conferences to send unto them, being divided according to the order following; also, that we will attend the general meeting every year, and at all parliaments, and as often as by order it shall be thought good to be assembled."*

This curious document furnishes an insight into the nature and intentions of the religious associations, incomparably more definite and satisfactory than all the colouring and scurrility of Dr. Bancroft and other partial writers. These puritans were, indeed, accused of having appointed certain general meetings, called synods, and others called classes, which were held in London, Cambridge, Oxford, and other places.—That in those assemblies, they had considered and determined what course should be taken by ministers in their several places.—That at their meetings, after prayer to God and a sermon, it was usually stated what had been discussed at a previous meeting; and they considered what subjects should be presented to the consideration of the next meeting. On these occasions, the learned divines who frequently assembled were Dr. Whitaker, and Messrs. Cartwright, Knewstubbs, Travers, Charke, Egerton, Greenham, Ward, Chadderton, Perkins, Dyke, Snape, and others.

Most of these divines were arraigned before the High-commission, and numerous accusations were alleged against them: That they had debated and decreed that those who could not preach were not ministers of Christ; and that the sacraments ought not to be received at their hands.—That one kind of doctrine ought to be preached by all who favoured reform; and that every minister ought, by all lawful means, to endeavour to introduce the proposed discipline.—That an oath, whereby a man was bound to reveal that which might be penal against himself or his brethren, was against charity, and ought not to be taken.—That the determinations adopted in synod had been published in their classes, and agreed to be put in execution; and that a classical meeting had been held at the Bull in Northampton, and in Mr. Snape's house, minister of

* Baker's MSS. vol. xv. p. 71.

Fausley, where certain decrees had been published, and made known to be executed.—That the ministers in Northamptonshire, who assembled at these meetings, were Mr. Snape, Mr. Stone of Warkton, Mr. Edwards of Courtenall, Mr. Spicer of Cooknoe, Mr. Atkins of Higham, Mr. Fletcher of Abington, Mr. Lark of Wellingborough, Mr. Proudlove of Weeden, Mr. King of Coleworth, Mr. Barbone, and others.

Mr. Snape was accused of having declared that a dumb minister was not the minister of Christ; and that he had strongly intimated the future overthrow of the antichristian yoke and government of bishops. He was also accused of having declared that the church of God ought not to be governed by lord-bishops, that there was a Christian equality among the ministers of Jesus Christ, and that such ministers ought not to be accompanied by troops and trains of attendants.—That church discipline was indispensably necessary, and that the church ought to be governed by pastors, doctors, elders, and deacons.—That some few were set apart to serve the Lord, who considered that true Christian people, and not the multitude of all sorts, formed the church of God.—That whatsoever device of man was brought into the church, to be used as part of the worship of God, was denominated spiritual whoredom, as proved from the second commandment.—That Mr. Snape, being asked how a man could be a minister of God, whose office depended on the authority of man, answered, that he had been in this perplexity himself; but rather than he would stand by virtue of any letters of orders, he would be hanged on a gallows.—That he had declared in favour of the government by pastors, doctors, elders, and deacons, and that all or some of the ministers before mentioned had entered on this service.*

Archbishop Whitgift sent a copy of these accusations to the lord treasurer, furnishing some insight into the spirit and proceedings of the bishops. Mr. Strype furnishes several very grave imputations; even that these articles tended to the infringement of her Majesty's royal power, the overthrow of the Reformation, the abolition of episcopacy, the taking away of the revenues of bishops and cathedrals, and that they even endangered her Majesty's safety and the peace of her kingdoms! How far these imputa-

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 16; Strype's Whitgift, p. 327—329.

tions are sustained by facts, the reader will easily judge. The puritan divines were prosecuted chiefly by means of Whitgift, first in the High-commission, then in the Star Chamber, and then detained a long time in prison. Groaning under these oppressions, they unitedly presented their petition to Lord Burghley, containing a detail of the treatment they had received; and, in the conclusion, they earnestly entreated his lordship to plead their cause in the presence of her Majesty, and, if practicable, to procure their release from miserable confinement.

They humbly supplicated his lordship to be delivered from their miserable state, as most dutiful subjects to a principal father of the commonwealth; as men trained in the schools of learning to one sometime nourished in one of the universities, of which, by affection and calling, he was the honourable patron; and as ministers of the gospel whom he had honoured, and from whom the gospel had received both protection and honour. They affectionately wished his lordship to understand that they knew not by what secret misinformation most of their houses had been forced open by officers, their studies, books, and private papers rifled by pursuivants, their persons attached and convened before her Majesty's High-commissioners. They were required to take an oath, as it was called, by inquisition or office; and by taking that indefinite and unnatural oath, they would have bound themselves to answer all questions proposed to them: whereunto they humbly prayed that such favour might be extended to them as, by the word of God, was due to its ministers; by which word they were not to be proceeded against, without accusation, confirmed by due witnesses. They also prayed his lordship that they might enjoy that favour which, by the laws of the land, belonged to all dutiful subjects. They conceived these proceedings to be such that the most expert and best learned could not escape the danger of these captious interrogatories; and that they were unsupported by the order of justice and equity, but encouraged untrue accusations, maliciously conspired and kept secret until the innocent were convicted. Whereas, in their opinion, as they informed his lordship, no subject ought to be put to answer without accusation and presentment in open court, by the oath of twelve men.

For these and other important reasons, enforcing their consci-

ences, they made humble and earnest suit to his lordship not to be urged by that oath; yet, for not taking it, they had been committed to prison, and kept there, some for half a-year, which was the least time that any of them had lain there, but some a much longer space, and a great part of this time in strange and *close* confinement, to the dangerous decay of their health, and the overthrow of their poor estates. During these sufferings, most of them had twice made humble suit by writing to the High-commissioners, professing their innocency of the things suggested against them; and that their refusing to take the oath proceeded not from any contempt of authority, in reverence and obedience to which, they desired to be examples to others, but from fear to take the name of God in vain, and to ensnare their consciences, by binding themselves to do that which God had forbidden. In addition to their long and close imprisonment, they had all save one been deprived of their livings, and degraded from their ministry; and were also still restrained of their liberty, without limitation, as if they had committed an offence deserving of perpetual imprisonment.

The prisoners, as they further informed his lordship, had been advised to present their lamentable distress to the gracious consideration of her Majesty, the best refuge under God of afflicted subjects. They were aware that they and their cause had not only become offensive to her Majesty, by the hard and untrue reports raised against them, but also the issue of these miseries proved injurious to the growth of religion, and dangerous to the state, by animating the malicious enemies to both. They, therefore, considered it to be their bounden duty to God, her excellent Majesty, and the state, also conducive to their own private peace, to move his lordship; and, on their bended knees, in the presence of Almighty God, they prayed his lordship, in the exercise of his accustomed wisdom and kindness, to weigh their case, and, according to its equity and importance, to become the honourable means unto their gracious prince: that her Majesty's displeasure being appeased, she might, in her accustomed clemency vouchsafe them her most gracious release. Thus would his lordship's humble suppliants more abundantly praise the Lord for his honour's worthy deeds, and continue their daily supplications to

Almighty God for his preservation in much honour, to the good of his country, the prosperity of the church of Christ, and his own everlasting comfort.*

This affecting petition was subscribed by Messrs. Cartwright, King, Fenn, Snape, Wight, Lord, Jewel, and Proudlove; but they did not obtain the least portion of relief. Whether the treasurer laid the case before the queen, we have not been able to learn; but, if he did, there was so mighty a counteracting influence at Lambeth, and her Majesty was already so deeply incensed against the petitioners, by the insidious representations of their adversaries, that there was not the most distant prospect of success. The ministers involved in these troubles, in addition to those already mentioned, were Messrs. Farmer, Rushbrooke, Wiggins, Littleton, Field, Lloyd, and Payne, most of whom were divines of great eminence for piety, learning, and usefulness. A paper, containing some additional information concerning the prisoners, was at the same time drawn up by Archbishop Whitgift, or his appointment, professedly stating what are called "their misdemeanors and illegal practices."

This document accused them of having long sought to advance their discipline, by petitions to the parliament, by supplications to the convocation, by writing in its defence, and by suffering in the cause; in all of which they had been defeated.—That they had penned a book of discipline, called a platform of officers and ordinances, for ecclesiastical government; and in that book the prince's supreme authority in ecclesiastical causes was not once moved, but transferred to certain assemblies of ministers and elders. To this book many ministers had subscribed, according to a set form in writing; and it was *supposed* that most of the ministers of their opinion in the realm had done the same. The form of subscription contained an approbation of the book, as agreeable to the word of God: one part treated of church discipline, as necessary at all times; the other part was called synodical, and treated of calling synods and the usage of the churches, which they desired to have established. They had promised, by suit to the council and the parliament, and by all other lawful and convenient means, to further and advance the book, and to be guided by it.—That in

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxxii. art. 50.

preaching they would follow that order which was there set down: they had also promised to follow the order set down concerning the meetings, which they had not failed to observe, by advancing that form of church government; also by attending their classical, provincial, and general assemblies, for the space of four years or more.

They were also accused of having debated and decreed to send certain persons to these assemblies, and to raise contributions to defray their expenses.—That they had resolved that private baptism was unlawful; that it was unlawful to read homilies in the church; that the sign of the cross in baptism might not be used; that the faithful ought not to communicate with unenlightened ministers; that the hierarchy, including all in superior authority, was unlawful; that when ecclesiastical authority was exercised by suspension, deprivation, deposition from the ministry, or excommunication, ministers were not to rest in the sentence of the bishops, but to continue their ministry, until otherwise compelled by civil force.—That it was not lawful to be ordained ministers by bishops, nor to denounce suspension, nor excommunication sent from them; nor to appear in their courts, without a protestation of their unlawfulness.—That diocesan bishops had no lawful function in the church of Christ; and that the people, on every proper occasion, were to be taught the necessity of church discipline; and when properly instructed in the knowledge of it, they were to exercise it, yet maintaining to the uttermost the peace of the church.

That, among their private papers, were found six very dangerous questions, tending to annul the ecclesiastical authority of Christian princes, and to the erection of this government, without her Majesty's consent!—That their platform of discipline, in addition to other erroneous points, contained many positions of great peril, being prejudicial to her Majesty's royal prerogative! By making all dignities and ecclesiastical benefices elective, they took away her Majesty's power in bestowing them. By making the last appeal to a national synod, or general assembly, they bereaved the crown of it. They were also accused of having denied that her Majesty had authority to make ecclesiastical laws; saying that, without injury to the ministers, she could not so much as prescribe the form of their apparel. They gave to the prince authority to see the

discipline erected and defended; and were accused of making the prince subject to the censure and excommunication of the eldership. They also gave the power of appointing public fasts to their church assemblies.

They were further accused that their discipline was prejudicial to the safety of her Majesty and her realms, affirming that, without the convention of the states of the kingdom, the prince might not treat of peace or war; and that the government of the state ought to be framed according to the government of the church.—That the children of papists and excommunicated persons were not to be baptized.—That the judicial law of Moses, in the punishment of certain offences, ought of necessity to be observed.—That their platform abrogated or changed many fundamental laws of the realm. One of the ministers was accused of having said, "This cause must prevail, in spite of the malice of all who are against it." Another was accused of having said, in a letter to a friend, "That, if the Christian magistrate, after so many petitions already presented, refuse to erect the discipline of Christ, they might do it themselves; and which they ought to promote with celerity, without lingering and staying so long for parliaments, where episcopal adversaries bear the greatest sway in God's matters." Another was accused of having inquired, "How bishops, deans, archdeacons, chancellors, advocates, proctors, and registers might be provided for, that the country might not be pestered with beggars?"*

The judicious reader will recollect that all these were mere accusations devised by their adversaries, whose minds were inflamed against them, and that they were collected from private papers and anonymous publications of which the prisoners were not the authors! Why then were they charged with them? We may conclude, however, that they contain the greatest evils and most odious charges, true or untrue, that their enemies could bring against them.

It is said that some of the ministers were detected of the premises, but we are not informed to what extent. They were required to answer on their oaths; but they all refused, using, it is said, "very frivolous and childish cavils!" How far their reasons

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 331—334.

were deserving this character the reader will judge, especially when he is reminded that the oath appeared to them contrary to law, against their consciences, and opposed to the word of God. They maintained that they ought to have been tried in open court, and by witnesses, as in the case of Paul and the deputy, who said, "I will hear thee when thine accusers are come." They conceived they were not bound by any law, human or Divine, to accuse themselves, or bring their friends into trouble. They alleged, in their defence, the example of Rahab, who would not reveal the spies to the king: the midwives, who refused the command of the king of Egypt: Jonathan, who, though commanded by the king, refused to kill David: the king's servants, who refused to murder the priests when he commanded them: Obadiah, who secured a hundred priests in caves to save them from Jezebel, who would have taken away their lives. These reasons, our author gravely observes, "they pretended;" and adds, "but the ground of their refusal was because they thought their doings were good and holy!" they would not, therefore, be instruments of detecting their brethren to the magistrates.*

Dr. Southey observes that the vast powers of the High-commission were "to examine offenders upon oath, and punish them by fine or imprisonment, at *discretion:*" yet, he adds, in the words of Archbishop Whitgift, "If any article did touch the party any way, either for life, *liberty,* or scandal, he might refuse to answer; neither was he urged thereunto!"† Was not the *liberty* of the prisoners, then, "any way" touched by their long and severe incarceration? But, whether they were "urged" to answer, and severely censured for refusing, the reader has already witnessed. The question, however, is not whether the powers of the High-commission "were less than those of the popish clergy," but whether they were not contrary to law, equity, and Christianity. When this writer affirms that "the practice was less objectionable than the principle,"‡ does he mean to insinuate that the persecution of the puritans was not objectionable and cruel, and more fitted to the days of Boniface VIII. than to the time of the Reformation under a protestant princess?

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 334. † Book of the Church, vol. ii. p. 299; Barlow, p. 173.
‡ Book of the Church, vol. ii. p. 299.

The prisoners assigned unequivocal reasons for refusing the barbarous oath. Though these reasons were unsatisfactory to the High-commissioners, who detained their victims in continued bondage, yet it cannot be doubted, if they had been pleaded by protestants at a popish tribunal, they would have obtained the commendation and applause of all sound protestants; why then should they be deemed unsatisfactory before the tribunal of protestant prelates? After they had refused the oath *ex officio*, the archbishop, who seemed at a loss what to do, proposed to his colleagues two questions for their grave consideration: "Whether it was expedient for the commonwealth, and her Majesty's service, to have the dealings of the prisoners more particularly discovered and suppressed? If it was, seeing this could not be effected by any other means than by the confession of such as were partakers of their conferences, what course was best to be taken for the terror of others—whether by *præmunire*, if by law they had incurred it, or by some exemplary punishment to be inflicted by the lords of the Star Chamber, or otherwise?"*

These discussions having terminated, Mr. Cartwright and the other prisoners were transferred to the inquisition of the Star Chamber. Their declining to take the oath gave great offence, tending to defeat the purposes of their persecutors; and, for refusing to accuse themselves and their friends, their conduct was censured as tending to the overthrow of common justice! It was, therefore, resolved to bring them to an examination in the Star Chamber; and it is added that far less offences than theirs had been punished by condemnation to the galleys, or perpetual banishment! Their spiritual inquisitors, therefore, concluded "the latter the fittest punishment" to be inflicted on their victims, provided they were sent "to some remote place whence they could never return!"

Having fallen into the hands, and under the displeasure of these protestant inquisitors, the prisoners had little expectation of either mercy or justice; but before any process was adopted, their sage judges collected certain doctrines and practices, which they represented as "tending to the erection of a new pretended discipline, and to the overthrow of her Majesty's government and prerogative,

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 335.

in causes civil and ecclesiastical!" This curious collection consists of a great number of sentences, and scraps of sentences, collected and transcribed from the controversial publications of the day; but of which it was well known that the prisoners were not the authors!* What shameful conduct was this! to collect scraps of sentences from other men's writings, then patch them together in the shape of accusations, and charge them against the prisoners! This long list of offences, accompanied with their own comments, the bishops presented to her Majesty, with the twofold design of raising the royal indignation against the prisoners, and of cloaking their own unworthy deeds! The archbishop and his colleagues had been at a loss what to do; but the court of the Star Chamber, with these memorials before them, adopted those prompt and decisive measures which ensured success.

The 13th of May, 1591, the prisoners appeared in this court before Archbishop Whitgift, the lord chancellor, the two lord chief justices, Lord Buckhurst, Mr. Fortescue, the attorney general, and Sir Francis Knollys. The attorney general accused them of having refused the oath; but when Mr. Fuller, the learned counsel appointed for the prisoners, attempted to answer, he was interrupted, and not allowed to proceed! This information Sir Francis Knollys, with grief, communicated to the lord treasurer the next morning.† This furnishes a specimen of the proceedings of these venerable guardians of the church, with Archbishop Whitgift at their head!

During the same month, Mr. Cartwright was carried alone before the High-commission, when he appeared before Bishop Aylmer, the attorney general, Dr. Lewin, Dr. Bancroft, Dr. Stanhope, and another whose name is not mentioned; but the archbishop was absent. On this occasion, he underwent a protracted examination, the substance of which is here recited. Bishop Aylmer commenced by a long invective, in which he not only expostulated roundly with Mr. Cartwright, but also threw out severe reproaches against him.‡ He accused him of having deceived the privy council by giving information that he was heavily afflicted, when that was not the case. Mr. Cartwright, however, rebutted the charge, and proved, by a written testimonial from his physician, that this accu-

* Strype's Whitgift, Appen. 138—141. † Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 84.
‡ Chalmers, vol. iii. p. 211; viii. 328.

sation was absolutely untrue; but, to prevent similar exposure in future, the archbishop obtained a sight of this testimonial from Mrs. Cartwright, and absolutely refused to restore it to the owner!* Bishop Aylmer accused Mr. Cartwright and the other prisoners of having abused her Majesty by suggesting, in their supplication, that the oath was not according to law, and that it had been offered them without limitation. He charged the prisoner with having confessed that a man might be saved by observing the orders of the church as by law established; therefore it was folly in him to seek further reformation. His lordship added that, in the principal matters for which he and others contended, they were of the same opinion as the papists, but the bishops agreed with the papists only in certain ceremonies; yet he affirmed those ceremonies were not indifferent when established, but those who refused them purchased to themselves condemnation!

The right reverend prelate having finished his invective, Mr. Cartwright attempted to speak in his own defence, but was interrupted, and not allowed freedom of speech. As soon as he commenced, the attorney general interposed and prevented him proceeding, making a long harangue against the prisoner. He endeavoured to show how dangerous it was that men, from the conceits of their own heads, yet under pretence of conscience, refused those things which had been received; and that the oath they had refused was according to the laws of the land, which he highly commended. He then observed that he had to deal with Mr. Cartwright on two points. The first was, the *peace* of the land, which was broken by holding unlawful meetings, and making laws! This was a most egregious misstatement: the puritans made no laws. The other point was the *justice* of the land, which, said the attorney, they had violated by refusing the oath! He then exhorted Mr. Cartwright to take the oath; and, since he was a man in years, he ought to have possessed more wisdom and discretion than others.

The attorney having concluded his address, Bishop Aylmer required the prisoner to take the oath; but this he waved, craving permission to answer the slanderous charges brought against him. This the prelate absolutely refused, not suffering him to answer

* Strype's Annals, vol. iv. p. 51.

till he had taken the oath; to which Mr. Cartwright replied that his case was very hard, by being grievously accused, then to have his mouth stopped, that he was not allowed to answer in his own defence. The bishop still urged him to take the oath, after which he should answer; but Mr. Cartwright replied that, since the articles were the same as those on which they would examine him by oath, he had already answered them, and, drawing his answer out of his bosom, he offered to be sworn to it, declining to produce any other answer, lest he should be a transgressor of the law of God.

Dr. Lewin, addressing Mr. Cartwright, wished him to understand how greatly he was deceived by calling this the oath *ex officio*, seeing it was in express words derived from the authority of the prince, by a delegated power from her Majesty; he ought, therefore, to take heed, lest, by refusing this oath, he should be found refusing that which the prince authorized. The bishop, having highly commended this, warned our divine to take heed, lest, by such refusal, he should directly oppose the authority of the prince. In calling it an oath *ex officio*, Mr. Cartwright observed that he had the warrant of that court, and of the bishop himself, who had so called it; also of another of the High-commission then present, who had called it "the oath of Inquisition." This the bishop denied; but, on Mr. Cartwright appealing to those present who had heard him, his lordship was silent! Mr. Cartwright alleged that he had seen commissions from her Majesty, in which there was no mention of proceeding by oath; and, attempting to proceed, he was interrupted by Dr. Bancroft, who said that High-commissions had been altered, as times and circumstances required. It was true, he said, that former commissions had not inserted the clause of proceeding by oath; but that there were certain persons discontented with the *state*, who had curiously searched into these things, and that Mr. Cartwright had copied from them. This excited some contention between the bishop and Dr. Bancroft, his lordship affirming his dislike of the doctor's saying, and the doctor maintaining what he had affirmed.

Mr. Cartwright, when allowed to speak, said there was a third consideration, in answer to Dr. Lewin and the bishop, that, though they might, by the words of her Majesty's commission, proceed by

oath, it did not follow that they might proceed by oath without any one to accuse, without the least limitation, without time for deliberation, and without advice what to answer. So he refused not simply to answer; but he refused to answer in the manner they required, which was not opposed to the queen's authority. This occasioned some debate on the difference between this oath and the oaths tendered in other courts; when Mr. Cartwright maintained that, although the oaths in other courts were expressed in general words, they related to some particular matter, with which the deponent was acquainted before he took the oath. He added that, in the title to the lands of the hospital at Warwick, he had taken the oath before certain commissioners, which was commonly given in other courts; and having acknowledged that he had taken an oath twenty years before, Dr. Bancroft asked him, why it was not then equally lawful? He replied that the two cases were not parallel. For then there was only one matter on which he was examined, and that was well known to him before he swore. If the prisoner had not been interrupted, he intended to have added that he took that oath with the exception, so far as was consistent with the glory of God and the welfare of his neighbour; and that by the example of others, who refused this oath before him, he took occasion to search further than he otherwise might have done, and he hoped he had not spent his time altogether in vain.

Dr. Bancroft declared that, as every man who had offended another was bound to confess his fault and reconcile himself, so he ought much more to do this to his prince. Mr. Cartwright replied that the two cases were dissimilar, and that this general rule admitted of certain exceptions; adding, "If I have spoken evil of any one, which never came to his knowledge, it would not be necessary, by the rule of charity, that I should open the matter to the person whom I had wronged, seeing it might break the chords of love, which, without that confession, would continue whole."

To the charge that the prisoners had holden conferences and made laws, Mr. Cartwright replied that his answer to this point was before them; and, if required, he would confirm it by his oath, that they never held any conferences by any authority, nor ever made any laws to procure any obedience whatever; also that he and others had expressly testified, by subscription, that they would

not voluntarily, nor by any mutual agreement, practise any advice or agreement that was contrary to any laws of the land. To which Dr. Bancroft replied that, as to authority they had none, and therefore could use none; and, as to compulsion, there needed none, seeing every one who was admitted to their conferences must subscribe to be obedient to all orders, which he and others should set down: even if they had set down the sense and interpretation of any place of Scripture, it could not be lawful for any one to depart from it. Mr. Cartwright, in answer, declared that he was most untruly accused of having exercised such ecclesiastical jurisdiction; for he never could consider it lawful for any one so to do, or to require subscription; and he protested that he had never required it, which he was ready to attest on his oath.

Dr. Lewin then urged the prisoner to take the oath, and assured him that they would accept any reasonable answer from him. To this Mr. Cartwright replied that he could not conveniently give any other answer than that which was before them. The bishop said they would then tell him wherein his answer was deficient, and would require another answer. So then, said Mr. Cartwright, the oath will not "put an end to controversy," notwithstanding this is the proper use of it. Dr. Bancroft excepted against this, declaring that an oath only *tended* to put an end to controversy; and that was strange which Mr. Cartwright had said, though, in fact, he had only cited a text of Scripture, without giving any interpretation. The doctor, further addressing him, said, "Do you think to go away in the clouds, or that you have to do with men of such small judgment as not to see what you aim at? Do not we know from whom you received your discipline and church government? Do not we know their judgments and their practice? Which, said he, is to bring in a further reformation *against* the will of the prince, and by *force of arms!* It is well known how one of the English church at Geneva wrote a book to move the people to take up arms against Queen Mary, and Mr. Whittingham wrote a preface to it. And who knoweth not that the church of Geneva allowed it? We have seen the practice in France. It is written in the Scotch story that Mr. Knox moved the nobility of Scotland to introduce the gospel by force against their queen. And it is well known that Mr. Calvin was banished from Geneva for

endeavouring to introduce the discipline against the will of the magistrate."

To these insinuations, Mr. Cartwright replied that he had no intention to hide himself in the clouds, as he had made a plain and direct denial; but, if any thing still remained doubtful, he would make it as plain as the doctor could set down. He perceived that, if all others had been like Dr. Bancroft, the attempts of persons to clear themselves by oath, as then required, would have been absolutely fruitless, seeing that whatsoever they might depose must be answered by the doctor, who knew well enough what they *aimed* at! He charged the doctor with having done injury to the reformed churches; which, said he, from what he knew or read, never were of that judgment, nor encouraged the practice to which he alluded. He had read the Scotch story, but could not remember ever to have met with what the doctor affirmed. If any persons had written from Geneva that which he had noticed, it was certainly hard judgment to charge the church of Geneva with it, especially as that church had utterly disclaimed that sentiment.

As the examination approached towards a close, Bishop Aylmer again demanded of the prisoner whether he would take the oath, and, on his continued refusal, commanded it to be entered on record. Dr. Bancroft affirmed that her Majesty had seen and read Mr. Cartwright's answer to the articles; and, notwithstanding this, she promoted these proceedings against him. In the conclusion, Mr. Cartwright reminded Bishop Aylmer that he had promised him the liberty of answering the charges brought against him; but this his lordship refused, declaring "he had no leisure to hear his answer!"*

This hard-hearted, oppressive prelate, found time to accuse and reproach Mr. Cartwright; but, contrary to equity and his own promise, he could not find time to hear his defence! A modern churchman charges Mr. Cartwright as agreeing with Dr. Bancroft "in elevating the ecclesiastical jurisdiction above the temporal," and that they "both aimed at the same predominance; but, to the utter disgrace of his character, this author adds that Mr. Cartwright attempted "the subjugation of the sovereign!"† These silly and untrue charges require no refutation. Mrs. Cartwright, having

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 50. † D'Israeli's Charles I. vol. iii. p. 233, 236.

been unkindly treated by the archbishop, had very gloomy prospects, and had doubtless spent many disconsolate hours, weeping over her bereaved and helpless children; yet she did not sink in despondency, but, with tender sympathy, exhorted her suffering husband to the exercise of pious constancy, refusing to surrender his conscience to the power of man! The affectionate husband, far distant from home, had the bitter remembrance of his beloved family, being conscious of their wants which he could not relieve, their sorrows which he could not sooth, and the reproaches and insults cast upon them from which he could not defend them. These were no common privations; but he trusted in the Lord, and found peace and consolation. "God was his refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble."

Bishop Aylmer's disgusting intolerance had scarcely any bounds, and his severe, not to say barbarous, usage of worthy ministers, at length, awakened those in power, and, to check his career, he was again convened before her Majesty's privy council. This galling occurrence touched his lordship's consequence; but, to prevent its return in future, he prayed the lord treasurer that he might henceforth appear before his lordship and one of the council: and, unless this was complied with, he would "give over sitting in the commission;" adding, "I would to God my lord of Canterbury was on the commission, that I might have some ease, for I am dead weary!"*

The repeated arraignment of a lord-bishop before the privy council, under the imputation of improper conduct, could not fail to touch his consequence, and it was not surprising that this was "greatly bruited" by the people; yet his lordship seems not to have recollected that all this disgrace and bruiting might have been prevented by his abstaining from the odious work of persecution. This hot-tempered prelate observed that he anxiously desired "some ease," and was "dead weary" of this work; but he seems never to have thought that he had the remedy in his own hands.† By ceasing to persecute his brethren, he would have found immediate relief from dead weariness. This prelate discovered far greater concern to punish men for scrupling ecclesiastical corruptions than for open transgression of the laws of God! But the oppressed puritans, even in the opinion of Aylmer, were sufficiently qualified to dispute

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xxxviii. art. 86. † Ibid.

with papists, yet not qualified to breathe the atmosphere of freedom! He censured their praiseworthy efforts to obtain the purification of the church from Romish relics, as attempts "against their brethren and against the state!" Who can wonder, then, that some of his colleagues were discouraged in such work, and that others relinquished this odious warfare.*

The foregoing authentic records exhibit a true character of the party, with the mode of conducting their proceedings, and show the superiority of the prisoner over his persecutors. The stand which he made against the *ex officio* oath, and the sufferings he endured in consequence, entitle Mr. Cartwright to the honour of a decided Christian and exemplary patriot. He would neither sell his conscience nor purchase his liberty to subserve the cause of despotism. It has been observed that Archdeacon Paley said, "He could not afford to keep a conscience;" but Mr. Cartwright resolved to keep his conscience, whatever it might cost him, nor would he cease to keep it for all the world. The interview between Aylmer, Bancroft, and others, terminated in Mr. Cartwright being remanded to the Fleet. The Lord Chancellor Hatton addressed a letter to Lord Burghley, recommending that his grace of Canterbury should appoint the Dean of St. Paul's and Dr. Andrews to confer with Mr. Cartwright and his fellow-prisoners; but whether this measure was adopted, or what was the result, we have not found on record.†

Sir Francis Knollys often wrote to the lord treasurer, complaining of the grievous assumption of the bishops; and, on one occasion, he not only stated their claiming arbitrary power, but also assured his lordship that this grievance must be put down. He said, "I do seek her Majesty's safety, which cannot otherwise be continued, but by the maintenance of her Majesty's supreme government, against the false-claimed superiority of bishops from God's own institution. The pride of the bishops' claim in this behalf must be pulled down, and made subject to her Majesty's supreme government; and they must confess that they have no superiority of government at all, but by commission from her Majesty: for otherwise their claimed superiority is treasonable to her Majesty, and tyrannous over the inferior clergy. But, if it may please God

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. xxxiii. art. 25. † Ibid. vol. lxviii. art. 5.

to move her Majesty's heart by your lordship's means; and, to the maintenance of her royal dignity, that this controversy may be discussed by the common consent of the most learned university-men, to whom the bishops must needs give place in the matter of true learning, because the chief divines of the university are not yet corrupted with worldly promotions, neither are they yet proud, nor touched with ambition nor covetousness, as the bishops' claimed superiority must needs be!"*

A petition was, at the same time, presented to Lord Chancellor Hatton and Lord Burghley, subscribed by ten justices of her Majesty's exchequer, imploring that measures might be used to prevent men from being imprisoned contrary to law. In this honest document they humbly implore their lordships "that such order may be taken that her Highness' subjects may not be committed and detained in prison against the laws of the realm, to their grievous charge and oppression, as witnessed in the Marshallsea, Fleet, King's Bench, and the Gatehouse. Divers have been sent for by pursuivants, though dwelling far distant from London, and compelled to pay the pursuivants great sums of money against law; and have been committed to prison till they would release the lawful benefit of their suits." It will be proper to add that the system here complained of was extensively successful; and that, in the various prisons of London, there were eighty-nine persons confined for their religion, twenty-four of whom were committed by the High-commission!† When the day of final reckoning shall arrive, what account will be given of these proceedings? He who robs his neighbour of trifling earthly property is arraigned before the tribunal of his country; but he who robs his countrymen of the rich treasures of their souls is allowed to escape, and to glory in his triumph! Though some mistaken persons, with professed candour and moderation, represent such conduct as inoffensive, or, at most, as only a slight infirmity, yet there is a day coming when all actions will be weighed in an even balance, and when the robbers of the rich treasures of souls will have none to plead their cause, but will stand speechless and condemned as the worst of felons!

Mr. Cartwright, though an outcast, was not forsaken, but revered and beloved as much as at any former period. His numerous friends,

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxiv. art. 69. † Ibid. vol. lxviii. art. 87; lxxx. 62.

some of whom were of high respectability, cherished strong Christian sympathy for him, and with whom he held intimate and confidential intercourse. Of this number was Mr. Anthony Bacon, a man of prodigious abilities, son of the famous Lord Keeper Bacon, and elder brother to the lord high chancellor,* the peace of whose family was interrupted by certain domestics, especially by the conduct of one Lawson, to whom Mr. Bacon was strongly attached. In these unhappy circumstances application was made to Mr. Cartwright, though a prisoner in the Fleet, and his wise and judicious counsel solicited for the adjustment of existing differences. Having investigated the affair, he communicated his sentiments by letter from the Fleet, May 23, 1591, addressing Mr. Bacon with due respect, yet with becoming freedom.

"My duty humbly remembered unto you. It may please you to understand that, of my speech with her ladyship some hour and a half, this was the effect, that after signification of your dutiful regard unto her ladyship, as in all other things so in this, of not doing any thing therein that may offend her; with this addition, that, as there is a duty of your honour to her ladyship in different things to live to her liking rather than to your own, so it is the duty of her ladyship towards you in the same things so much the more especially to use her affectionately, as, by age and instruction out of the word of God, I esteemed you able to govern your own ways. My humble desire unto you is that, as I hope you will, you would stir up yourself to answer the good opinion which your wise and religious discourse gave me occasion to conceive, and, so far as might upon so small an offence, to make report to her ladyship."

Mr. Cartwright further observed that though Lawson, who had been a servant in the family, professed "repentance and sorrow for his misbehaviour," yet his prospect of an adjustment was so discouraging that he had but little hope of success; and thus concluded his epistle: "I have written unto you, that you might either give over the suit that hath so small hope of being obtained, or else, if it should so greatly concern you, you might think of some stronger and more able hand to work it than I am. Thus, with my humble thanks unto yourself for still keeping open the door of your acquaintance unto me, and Mr. Francis for so ready an

* Biog. Brit. vol. i. p. 502.

opening of it unto us, I commend you both, with your affairs, unto the gracious keeping and blessing of God in Jesus Christ. Your worship's to command in the Lord."*

Mr. Cartwright and his brethren in durance, Messrs. Fenn, Lord, Snape, Wight, King, Proudlove, Jewel, and Payne, were again convened before the Star Chamber, when a bill was exhibited against them, in which, after the preamble, a declaration of their innocence and their solicitude for a better reformation, were contained *twenty-two* distinct articles, with their answers subjoined. From this long train of particulars, devised by their enemies, and their answers drawn up by themselves, we learn what both parties had to say; and, as they not only contain authentic information, but also reflect considerable light on these occurrences, a summary of the whole is, therefore, submitted to the consideration of the reader. The first accusation is thus expressed:—

That Thomas Cartwright, Edmund Snape, Humphrey Fenn, Edward Lord, Daniel Wight, Andrew King, William Proudlove, Melancthon Jewel, John Payne, and other seditious persons, have unlawfully and seditiously assembled together concerning these premises.—The defendants confessed, excepting Mr. Jewel and Mr. Payne, that they had held sundry meetings and conferences, by the common right of subjects, but especially by the right of Christianity, as students and ministers of Jesus Christ, for their mutual edification.

They have unlawfully concluded sundry seditious articles, not only in approbation of the foresaid discipline, but also for putting in execution sundry things contained in them.—The defendants confessed that they had consulted about a draught of discipline which they considered lawful, as the common right of subjects to study and advise the redress of things out of order.

These defendants have seditiously submitted to the said seditious articles, and, for the better approbation of their submission, they have subscribed those articles.—Messrs. Cartwright, Lord, Fenn, Wight, and King confessed that they subscribed certain articles, annexed to the book of discipline, for the reasons already mentioned, especially that of showing their consent. The articles

* Sloane MSS. vol. 4115, art. 2.

they subscribed were only a declaration of their judgment, leaving the determination to her Majesty and the parliament, which was made above *three* years before the information was exhibited.

These defendants have agreed that all ministers should follow the order of the book, concerning preaching, baptism, and the Lord's Supper.—The last-named defendants promised, above three years ago, to observe some things contained in the book; but the promise was voluntarily, both in making and performing, and void of constraint or censure, and related only to things left free by law.

They have prescribed a new form of public prayer, differing from that established by law, which the defendants have used in sundry parts of her Majesty's dominions.—The defendants denied to have used, or caused to be used, any other form of common-prayer than that established; nor did the book mentioned in the information prescribe any book containing common-prayer.

They have ordained that no persons should be received to the communion, except those who subscribed that form of discipline.—The defendants denied that they had ever put in practice any such order, neither had they allowed it.

The defendants have promised to follow the order set down in the book of discipline, so far as concerned the ministers of the word. To which purpose they have promised to meet in classical and provincial assemblies, and at every parliament.—They confessed that they had promised to meet in conference, as they might by the laws of the land, and consistent with the peace of the church; thereby declaring their desire to have things reformed by *law only,* and *not by force* ,which they held to be unlawful, and protested they never purposed or thought of the same.

The defendants have unjustly taken upon themselves power and authority, without her Majesty's consent, to treat and conclude upon all the common affairs of the churches, concerning doctrine, discipline, and other matters.—They declared that they desired the practice of the reformed churches to be established by public authority; but they denied that they ever claimed any such power and authority as here stated.

The defendants, on pretence of discipline and charity, have unjustly claimed to themselves power to deal in *all manner* of

causes whatsoever.—They denied ever to have attempted any such causes; and the book mentioned in the information expressly forbade ministers dealing in *civil* matters; neither had they, under any pretence whatever, claimed power to deal in such causes.

The defendants have called these assemblies at their own pleasure.—Unless a voluntary agreement to meet, without exercising any authority, could be accounted a calling, they had not called any assembly.

The defendants ordained that none should vote in any of their assemblies but those who subscribed their discipline.—Though the establishment of this was desired of her Majesty and the parliament, yet the greatest part of those who met in conference *never* subscribed that form of discipline.

The defendants, in observing their promise and subscription, have very seditiously assembled with others, at Cambridge, as in a provincial assembly, where they concluded and ordained that the discipline should be taught on all occasions.—They declared they had not concluded that the discipline ought to be taught on all occasions, but upon plain and decisive texts of Scripture, teaching the truth with sobriety and moderation.

That in the year 1588, the defendants, with others, assembled at Warwick, where they again considered and allowed the foresaid articles concluded at Cambridge.—To this they declared that they knew not of any such meeting, and were sure there was no such thing concluded by them.

The defendants have, at sundry times, and in sundry places, made several assemblies concerning the cause aforesaid.—They confessed that they had assembled for the purposes they had already stated; but, as to times, places, and persons being indefinite in the bill, they hoped the court would make no further inquiry.

The defendants, by writing, preaching, and teaching publicly, set forth the said manner of government comprised in their seditious books.—If it were of writing private letters and papers found in their studies, they hoped, if they had done either, it was not against law or the inquiry of this court, except they contained henious offences, of which they hoped they were not suspected; and as to their preaching, they referred to the judgment of their hearers.

They have done all they could devise, how false and untrue soever, to slander, defame, and deprave the ecclesiastical government, the form of common-prayer, and administration of the sacraments established.—They denied to have done or devised any thing falsely or unjustly for any such purposes.

By several letters, and other persuasions, they have unlawfully persuaded her Majesty's subjects to allow and submit to the said newly-devised form of discipline, to the imminent danger and utter overthrow of this flourishing commonwealth.—They utterly denied that they had at any time whatsoever persuaded any person to submit to the practice of that form of discipline without the authority of the magistrate.

The defendants, being convened to answer upon their oaths such articles as should be ministered unto them concerning their said misdemeanors, thereby to discover who made the book, or joined with them in making, allowing, or executing any part thereof, they have utterly refused to take the said oath, alleging that it was unlawful for them to answer upon their oaths; using that practice to cover their lewd purposes, until, by multitude of lewd accomplices, they were able, by *force,* to put the same in practice, which they had underhand seditiously devised and concluded, to the utter overthrow of her Majesty's royal estate and government.—They replied that, for supposed contempt, they had already been long imprisoned, deprived, and degraded, all excepting one. They refused the oath as not being agreeable to the word of God, for want of certain limitation, and for want of convenient time for deliberation. They were without accusers, yet they were committed to prison almost half a year before they saw the articles which they answered, especially Thomas Cartwright, though not compellable by law; but they denied having refused the oath as suggested in the information, and they sought reformation only by petitioning those in authority.

The defendants have, at sundry times and places, persuaded her Majesty's subjects to refuse an oath concerning their unlawful doings.—This they utterly denied.

The defendants have, by letters and otherwise, very seditiously moved and incited sundry of her Majesty's subjects, in a tumultuous manner, to exhibit to her Majesty several petitions in favour

and commendation of the said offenders, and for their enlargement, impeaching the just proceedings against them.—They observed that the supplications exhibited to her Majesty contained nothing in the least offensive; but that divers petitions were exhibited at one time. They considered it not unlawful to procure supplications to her Majesty in a peaceable manner: but Messrs. Cartwright, King, Payne, and Jewel procured no supplication, nor knew of any for them; and the rest confessed that, having been imprisoned, and four of them a long time, and having presented many supplications to the High-commissioners, and waiting long without hope of comfort, they, at length, advised their congregations to make humble supplication to her Majesty in their behalf.

The said petitions were brought up to London, and delivered to Edmund Snape, Humphrey Fenn, and Edward Lord, who, without consent or privity of the persons who subscribed them, made alterations and additions therein, and caused them to be newly written, and subscribed the names of the said persons, and caused the altered petitions to be exhibited to her Majesty.—The defendants here mentioned declared that they neither altered nor added to these petitions, neither caused them to be newly written and subscribed. They further declared that they endeavoured to conduct themselves in the most becoming manner to her Majesty, her laws, and the welfare of her people; and they prayed that they might not, upon mere suggestions, be drawn into disgrace, and that her Majesty's favour might be recovered, and they restored to their former liberties.*

This long train of charges may afford the reader some information; but here we find nothing said of witnesses, nor of evidence to substantiate facts; nothing said of a regular process at law, nor any investigation before a judge and a jury: but the whole consists of bare accusation and bitter invective. By these unjust, not to say barbarous methods of proceeding, any man, or any body of men, might be disgraced and ruined; they are, therefore, denominated *hot* transactions.† There is much said of disobedience to her Majesty's laws, of seditious assemblies, and of attempts to overthrow the church and her Majesty's government; similar to which, in every age, have been the untrue fulminations to frighten

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 43. † Strype's Whitgift, p. 378.

the best of Christians. While the puritan Reformers patiently bore these foul imputations, they were allowed, at least on this occasion, to speak for themselves; and though the word of the accused will not be admitted as sufficient evidence in his own cause, especially when there is satisfactory evidence to rebut his testimony, yet it may be presumed that the answers given by these faithful servants of God will be admitted to be of some weight, especially as their statements were not opposed by any conflicting evidence whatever.

These accusations were first presented to her Majesty's inspection, then brought against the prisoners in the Star Chamber, who made known many things which their judges were unable to discover, by declaring all the particulars contained in the foregoing answers. Immediately after these odious proceedings, Mr. Cartwright addressed a letter, authorised by his brethren, to Lord Burghley, dated from the Fleet, June 2, 1591; and having stated the disgraceful measures which had been adopted, protesting their inoffensive conduct to her Majesty and the state, he observed that it was their desire and humble suit that his lordship might understand the truth of those things with which they were accused before her Majesty. They refused not to bear the punishment which they deserved; but, if it should appear to his lordship that in their most secret meetings and consultations, for which they never thought they should have been brought under examination, they had conducted themselves with all dutiful affection, both to her Majesty and the laws of the land, they might, by his honourable means, be relieved from her Majesty's high indignation, which, by untrue information, she had conceived against them; also, that they might escape the hard course which was threatened against them.

As his lordship's manifold affairs would not suffer him to turn over the long book on both sides containing a detail of the proceedings, he was bold to send his lordship an abstract, having the answer on one side, directly opposite the information on the other. He then concluded by expressing his humble remembrance and acknowledgment of special bounden duty to his lordship, humbly commending him to the gracious protection and blessing of God, to whom he daily prayed that, after a long life and much honour,

he would give him the crown of glory, which he had promised to all them that love his appearing.*

Archbishop Whitgift also furnished his lordship with information on this subject; and, having given a sketch of the charges against the prisoners, his grace made these animadversions: The defendants, said he, confessed their refusal to take the oath before the High-commission; and to the most material matters, they made an uncertain and insufficient answer; which being referred by the court to the consideration of the chief justices, the chief baron, and Mr. Justice Gawdy, they set down wherein their answers were insufficient, and that they ought to answer the same particularly and directly. He stated that their answer was in many points as imperfect as before, and that in some points they had even opposed the report of the judges, that they ought not to answer. To cure them of the evil here complained of, certain interrogatories were administered to them on those parts of the bill which they were supposed not to have answered, the consideration of which the court had committed to the judges, who took upon them not only to specify which of the accusations ought to be better answered, but, remarkable as it may appear, they also stated in what respects they should be answered, and that they should be answered accordingly!

It does not appear what was the immediate result of these measures; but the prisoners, as by a protestant inquisition, were examined by the following interrogatories: "Where are the assemblies held?—When, and how often?—Who attended the assemblies?—What matters were treated of in them?—Who made, set forth, or corrected the book of discipline, or any part thereof?—Who subscribed or submitted to the said book, or to the articles therein concluded, besides the said defendants?—Is the king, in a Christian monarchy, to be accounted among the governors of the church, or among those who are to be governed by pastors, doctors, and such like?—Is it lawful for the sovereign prince, in a well-ordered church, to appoint orders and ceremonies to the church?—Is the ecclesiastical government, established by her Majesty's authority within the Church of England, lawful, and to be allowed by the word of God?—Are the sacraments ministered in her

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 52.

Majesty's dominions, and according to the Book of Common-prayer, godly and rightly ministered?"*

The prisoners of course refused to answer these impertinent interrogatories. They were repeatedly arraigned and examined in the Star Chamber; but they uniformly failed to give their inquisitors the information they sought to obtain. This was indeed impossible, unless they had not only answered directly every impertinent question proposed to them, but also confessed every offence with which they were accused. Though the particulars of these repeated examinations do not appear on record, yet another string of interrogatories, consisting of numerous heads, was administered to Mr. Cartwright and his brethren. As these articles reflect considerable light on the proceedings, and may be equally amusing and gratifying to the inquisitive reader, they are here inserted:—

"Do you know or understand that these defendants, or any of them, used to meet in conferences and synods, classical, provincial, and national, according as such assemblies are set down in the book mentioned against them, or otherwise have used to meet and confer together, and that by a free and voluntary consent amongst themselves as might best suit their convenience?—Do you know that any of these defendants did ever in their conferences propound and treat of any civil matters, the administration whereof peculiarly appertains to the civil magistrate, touching her Majesty's supremacy, or any prerogative or royalty pertaining to the crown?—Do you know that it was consulted or debated, in any conference, that the discipline aforesaid, not finding allowance by authority of her Majesty and parliament, should be brought in *by force*, or by any other than dutiful and peaceable means; as prayers to Almighty God, supplications to her Majesty and parliament, and due information of the cause?—Do you know that the defendants, or any of them, did ever allow or persuade any of the people to practise the discipline without the assent of the civil magistrate?—Do you know of any thing done by them whereby it might be gathered that they had intent that any of the things agreed upon, either in the book of discipline or otherwise, should have the nature of a law, and so be executed without authority of her Majesty and parliament?"

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 53.

The prisoners were further interrogated, "Do you know that the said defendants have used to meet in conference together about any other matters than honest, and godly, and dutiful both to her Majesty's state and person, and all authority that is set over them; such as were to make supplication both to her excellent Majesty, the whole parliament, the right honourable of her council, to the reverend assembly of the convocation-house, and particularly to the bishops; further also to advise how to satisfy authority in the fear of God, concerning the subscription and use of the Book of Common-prayer, required of them, and to inform themselves of the truth, touching the controversies of this time, and other furtherances, with such like?—Do you know that the said defendants, or any of them, did ever elect, ordain, or confirm any minister of the word, church-elder, or deacon? or that they erected or practised the authority of any eldership? or censured any by suspension or excommunication, or punished any by any civil punishment whatsoever? or that there were any appeals from a smaller to a greater conference either made or received?—Do you know that there was any consultation about using publicly, within this land, any form of public prayer other than that which is established by law, before the same should have allowance from authority of her Majesty and parliament? or that they publicly practised any such? or that they have practised an order in preaching contrary to the laws of the land?"

The inquiry was pressed upon them, "Do you know that the order of not receiving any to the communion, without submitting themselves to the form of discipline mentioned in the book, was agreed to be practised before the establishment of it by the authority of her Majesty and parliament?—Do you know that the order mentioned in the book of discipline, concerning not having conference with any who had not subscribed, was ever executed, or agreed to be executed, without authority of her Majesty and parliament?—Have you, or any other to your knowledge, been persuaded by any of the defendants to forsake any calling in the church, according to law established, to refuse to appear at the courts ecclesiastical, and, contrary to the inhibition given from authority, to execute the ministry?"

They were further interrogated by these questions: "Have you

known that any of the defendants have, in their conferences or otherwise, allowed or favoured the schismatics, commonly called Brownists or Barrowists? or have you not understood that they have advised how they might recover such as had been drawn away by them from the unity and communion of the church, and to stay in it such as sought to be seduced from it?—Have you known that these defendants were at a conference at Cambridge in the year 1587, and that it was concluded and ordained that homilies should not be read in the church, that the authority and calling of bishops were unlawful, and that there ought to be no superiority in church government, and such other matters as in the information against them is declared?—Have you known that the defendants, or some of them, have been so far from making any separation from the church, or defacing or depraving of authority, or matters established, as that they have disallowed and condemned the immodest and slanderous writing of Martin?—Have you known that these defendants, in conference at Warwick in the year 1588, approved and allowed of the foresaid articles, supposed to have been agreed upon at Cambridge?—Have you known that they advised that the discipline in question should not be taught, but upon just occasion of the places of Scripture to be expounded, and the same not sought for, but offered by the ordinary and continued text to be handled; and then also with all sobriety and modesty, and without any immodest and unseemly speeches tending to disgrace any order established?"*

What could the persecutors mean by requiring the prisoners to answer these multifarious questions? Did they wish to draw them into a confession of guilt, then punish them for what they confessed? These hard measures, more like the cruelties of a Romish conclave than a court of justice in a protestant country, ought to be recorded as a warning to semi-papists and a lesson to posterity. It does not appear what answers the prisoners returned, nor whether they returned any answers to these disgraceful inquiries. They possessed too much good sense, and too conscientious a regard for the truth of God, to accuse themselves and one another, and to betray the cause of Jesus Christ. These grievous oppressions excited the sympathy and compassion of avowed pro-

* Strype's Whitgift, Appen. p. 157, 158.

testants at home and abroad; and, at this juncture, King James of Scotland, and heir to the English crown, became their zealous patron, making intercession for them in a letter to Queen Elizabeth, and affectionately soliciting her Majesty to show favour to the prisoners, especially on account of their great learning and faithful travails in the gospel.

"Right excellent, high and mighty prince, our dearest sister and cousin, in our heartiest manner we recommend us unto you.

"Hearing of the apprehension of Mr. Udal and Mr. Cartwright, and certain other ministers of the evangel within your realm, of right good erudition and faithful travails in the church, we hear a very credible good report. Howsoever their diversities from the bishops and others of your clergy, in matters touching them in conscience, have been a means by their dilation to work them to your misliking. At this present time, we cannot (weighing the duty which we owe to such as are afflicted for their consciences in that profession) but by our most affectionate and earnest letter, interpose us at your hands, to stay any harder usage of them for that cause; requesting you most earnestly that, for our cause and intercession, it may please you to let them be relieved of their present straits, and whatsoever further accusation or pursuit is depending on that ground, respecting both their former merit in setting forth the evangel, the simplicity of their consciences in this defence, which cannot well be their let by compulsion, and the great slander which could not fail to fall upon their further striving for any such occasion. Which we assure us your zeal for religion, besides the expectation we have of your good will to please us, will readily accord with our request, having such proofs from time to time of a like disposition to you in any matter which you recommend unto us. And thus right excellent, right high and mighty princess, our dear sister and cousin, we commit you to God's protection. From Edinburgh, June 12, 1591."*

The royal intercession was unavailing; but whether King James changed his opinion of Mr. Cartwright's learning, character, and usefulness with the change of his religion is of little moment to invite inquiry, yet his religion and other characteristics were sufficiently understood. Notwithstanding his Majesty's application,

* Fuller, b. ix. p. 203, 204.

the learned Udal was left to linger and die in prison; and the haughty queen, always too fond of her prerogative, treated the other prisoners with total inattention: so they continued to bemoan their severe close imprisonment. These extreme hardships might have been expected under the oppressive yoke of popery; and they will remain as a mark of infamy on our protestant country so long as men are capable of claiming their indubitable rights. Mr. Cartwright, in addition to other painful trials, was heavily afflicted with the stone and sciatica, which had greatly increased by lying in a dreary cold prison; he therefore presented several petitions for restoration to liberty. He first wrote a most humble and pious letter to Lady Russell, with whom he had been long intimately acquainted, and from whom he had received many kind favours. This excellent lady had generously offered to make intercession for him to the lord treasurer in any request that he wished to present, and he gratefully acknowledged her ladyship's courtesy and kindness; but, having experienced so many painful disappointments, he scarcely knew what request to make. He had already petitioned to be released on bail, a privilege often granted to grievous offenders; but his humble suit had been utterly disregarded. He was falsely accused, and his character openly aspersed by Bishop Aylmer; and, having refuted this disgraceful usage, he committed his case to her ladyship's honourable consideration, submitting to her judgment and discretion to communicate to the treasurer whatsoever she might think proper. This epistle, dated from the Fleet, August 13, 1591, breathing the spirit of ardent piety, will doubtless be acceptable to the reader, and is here inserted:—

"I am glad, right honourable, that what I might truly do, I did agreeable to your honour's liking, touching the mention of your worthy father, (Sir Anthony Coke,) in my letters that I wrote to you. Howbeit, to commend you by your father is to praise the person by his shadow, or the lion by his claws, which is a slender praise, when there are better notes than these. For besides the mark of learning in yourself, rare in your sex, which is worthy of commendation, especially as you favour those who are learned, or rather, as myself, who desire to be learned. Yet this is not that wherein your praise doth or ought to consist, as that

which already of all other parts of the flower of the grass tarrieth longest; yet it fadeth away, and is no better than a summer flower, not able to resist the scythe of death, if, by the winter storm of sickness or of old age, it be not before prevented. So that the fame and report that rises from thence hath no more steadiness than the voice which is committed to the air, or writing on the water. Godliness *alone* is that which endureth, and maketh to endure such as have possession of it. For which, although I might be persuaded to commend your honour, having heard somewhat from others, and had some experiences myself, yet I had rather exhort you to a further increase therein than enter into the praise of that which the Lord hath already begun. For besides that there wanteth not peril of slackening our course towards the goal of the crown of glory, even when we are established in our opinion of some good advancement, that the praise of that which is good in us is seldom safe, unless it be mingled with the reproof of that which remaineth still amiss, and shall remain as long as we be compassed with this body of sin. Which latter, when it belongeth not unto me that know not your honour's wants, as I have been made acquainted with the good things which the Lord God hath planted in you, I easily see a law of silence laid upon me in that which my suitors especially do willingly pursue.

"I cannot pass by your singular and very rare favour towards me, whom it pleased to become a kind of suitor *to me*, that your honour might do me good, by preventing, through your honourable offer, that which partly my poor estate, and partly the small means of access by any duty of mine sent before, did shut me from. Yet I forget not your honourable and kind usage of me when I was with you five years past. So far as it pleased you to call in two noble plants, your daughters, and in my hearing to tell them that I was a man whom, for good reports, you favoured, and willed them to do the same when any occasion might serve for righteousness. But, alas! good madam, what encouragement could I take when, looking into myself, I see so little that might bear out that opinion which you had conceived of me. Howbeit, seeing it pleaseth you, in your honourable disposition, thus to break upon me, and after a sort to enforce your honourable assistance of me, it

were too foolish and rustical a shamefacedness to refuse so honourable a hand reached forth unto me.

"Wherefore, with very humble and thankful acknowledgment, I lay hold of your honourable favour, which, although it should come alone and unaccompanied, it is that for which I will take myself greatly beholden to your honour. Then I lay hold of the fruits of your favour, so far as the same may be convenient for your estate, in your honourable mediation towards such as you shall think good, especially towards my singular good lord the lord treasurer, of whom what to desire I know not. His honour knoweth the pitiful case wherein we stand. I trust also that he knoweth how innocent we are of the things with which we stand charged, if, on account of his great and weighty affairs, it had pleased him to inform himself of the proceedings with us. We thought the suit of ministers, upon reasonable bail, to return to their houses and their flocks, among whom some of us have preached the gospel thirty years of her Majesty's reign, would not have been refused, being that which is oftentimes yielded to felons, and hath been often granted to recusant papists. We being, therefore, refused this favour, I know not what we should make suit for.

"It again astonishes me that we are not easily suffered to come to her Majesty by our most humble supplication. In the empire of Rome there was not the vilest servant to whom the emperor's image, standing in the midst of the market-place, was not a good sanctuary, if he once laid hold of it; and with us it hath always been far better. For by supplication the poorest subject might come, not to the image of our most gracious prince, but to the prince herself. These things make me that, as I said before, I know not what to desire. But if I might understand what were likely to be granted, although it were ever so little, whereof it would please his honour to be an honourable means, there is no ease so small but we would gladly and thankfully embrace.

"Now, besides the common calamity of us all, mine hath something by itself. For all the other prisoners for this cause have access to them all their friends; but the warrant of the High-commission restrains me from all, saving my wife, and such as have necessary business with me, which thing I would be well con-

tented with, if it were afforded me accordingly. If I might, I would not, for divers causes, have many come to me. But the warden of the Fleet, whether esteeming thereby to gratify the bishops and others, to whom he thinks this will be pleasing, or of his own hard disposition towards me, construeth it more strictly against me than was the meaning of the High-commission. For I take that upon experience of the multitudes, who visited me the last time I was in prison, (as much to my liking as theirs,) they sent the warrant of this restraint; yet I dare not complain of this hard usage more than other keepers of their prisoners, lest he might use that as a mean to cause the bishops to restrain them also from the access of their friends. But it is a thing, I thank God, that I can well bear; therefore I will not trouble your honour with the suit of so small a matter.

"If again I should make suit on account of my infirmities, the gout especially, which grows upon me, it is likely that the council is informed that I complained of them without a cause: for the Bishop of London speaking openly, that I had therein abused her Majesty's privy council; yet he would not hear me, although I humbly beseeched him to suffer me to answer. If he would have allowed me, I could have alleged the testimony of the physician, who had witnessed it under his hand, which the archbishop took from my wife, and would not restore it again! I could also have brought good testimony how, having but small comfort from the physician, that physic would do me no good in prison, but the air might check my complaint; yet was I fain to take divers strong purgations, one within three or four days of another, to such a pulling down of my body that I was scarcely able to bear mine own clothes. Now to do all this without cause of disease, I think, might be deemed frenzy rather than hypocrisy. And, surely, I was far from being ambitious in laying down my infirmities before the board of her Majesty's most honourable privy council, seeing that I did not once make mention of the *sciatica*, with which I have been exercised many years.

"But I perceive I have given up too much the reigns to the grief of my mind, out of which my pen hath been very liberal to utter my complaint to your honour. Wherefore I will make an end, leaving all to your honourable consideration what to keep to

yourself, and what to communicate to his lordship; what to ask, or what to leave unasked; that is to say, what you think his lordship can conveniently, and with his good liking, effect, making no doubt that his honour standeth favourably inclined towards me. If I obtain nothing else, I most humbly pray his lordship that I may still remain in that good opinion which he hath conceived of me, at least so far as to be free from those misdemeanors which the lord-bishops do surmise. And thus, with my humble thanks for all your honourable favour and care for me, I commend your honour and your whole household, and especially your children, to the gracious keeping and blessing of God in Jesus Christ. Your honour's humbly to command."*

On the reception of this moving epistle, Lady Russell, with bowels of compassion, immediately sent the letter to the lord treasurer, after writing upon it these words: "My good lord, read this through; and do what you can for the poor man."† Notwithstanding these generous attempts, the oppressed prisoner obtained no redress. Lady Russell's worthy efforts were attended with no better success than those of King James. The lord treasurer was both willing and desirous to gratify the request of these honourable supplicants, and to do every thing in his power to procure ease to the prisoners; but he was only one of the council, and wished to interfere as little as possible in ecclesiastical affairs, in which the archbishop had all power in his hands, "whose *finger*," it is humorously said, "moved more in ecclesiastical matters than all the *hands* of the council together."‡

These unsuccessful efforts were extremely painful and discouraging to the prisoners; yet they were not prevented from making further attempts to obtain redress. Conscious of their innocence, and of the goodness of their cause, their minds were stored with peace and comfort in their dreary abodes; and, undismayed with repeated disappointment, they were inspired with courage and magnanimity in their renewed addresses to those in power, to whom Mr. Cartwright and his brethren presented several petitions. They addressed one to Lord Burghley, two at least to Sir Francis Knollys, and one to all the lords of the council. In the

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 58. † Ibid.

‡ Fuller, b. ix. p. 218.

first of these documents, dated from the Fleet and other prisons, December 4, 1591, they complained of the painful trial they had endured by upwards of a year's imprisonment, and how deeply this had affected the state of their health; they resolved, therefore, to address their humble petition to her Majesty's privy council to be released according to law, and until they should be called to the further trial of their innocence. They also deemed it prudent, besides their petition to the lords, to address their humble suit to his lordship, not only as defendants to a principal judge of the court where their cause depended, but also as children of the land to the chief father, who took no pleasure in their afflicted state, but would, as they were persuaded, tenderly weigh it, so far as an equal course of justice might procure relief. They doubted not that his lordship, in the exercise of his wisdom, and in experience of the condition of students, could easily discern that a year's imprisonment and more, which they had all suffered, must strike deeper into their health, considering the manner of their bringing up, than a number of years to men following the common occupations of life.

They, moreover, reminded his lordship that it was well known that divers papists, not only denying her Majesty's lawful authority, but giving it to a stranger, yea to the sworn enemy of their prince, had, nevertheless, received the favour of freedom from imprisonment. But there was not one of them who had not sworn to her Majesty's supremacy, and some of them several times; and, if it were doubted how they were then affected, though they had given no cause of suspicion, yet, to satisfy those in authority, they were ready to take the oath again.

Those who were not well affected towards them accused them of having adopted other interpretation than that which was the meaning of the law: yet had they verily no other interpretation than that of all the reformed churches, in the dutiful acknowledgment of the authority of magistrates; none other than her Majesty's own admonition in her injunctions, with the thirty-seventh article of the convocation; and especially the most authentic and classical writers of this church, as bishops, deans, and other distinguished men, with the oversight of the bishops themselves; and, finally, with the great commendation of all who had

written on the subject, or had stood forwards against the papists, who had falsely and slanderously surmised that her Majesty had enriched herself with the spoil of Jesus Christ; yet these papists, writing ignorantly against them, and being influenced by a dislike of them, had crossed and contradicted their own sentiments.

They concluded by craving pardon for their boldness in having detained his lordship from his weighty affairs in the state, and expecting that favour from his lordship which either equity or an impartial consideration of their afflicted state might require. And, according to their most bounden duty, they considered themselves to be especially bound to his lordship, and they would not cease daily to commend his most honourable estate to Almighty God for long continuance in life, with great increase of piety and honour. Subscribing themselves "prisoners in sundry prisons in and about the city."*

The names annexed to this petition were Messrs. Cartwright, Fenn, King, Lord, Snape, Wight, Payne, Jewel, and Proudlove. These oppressed divines next laid their affecting case before Sir Francis Knollys, their zealous friend and advocate, and one of her Majesty's privy council, who, having received their humble petition, warmly espoused their cause, and immediately addressed the following letter to Lord Burghley:—

"My very good lord,—I forbear to come to you, partly for lack of full strength, and partly to avoid your trouble by being cumbered with my weak body. Yet I cannot but signify thus much to you in writing, that I do marvel how her Majesty can be persuaded that there is as much danger of such as are called puritans as there is of the papists; and yet her Majesty cannot be ignorant that the puritans are not able to change the government of the church, but only by petition to her Majesty: and her Majesty cannot do it, but she must first call a parliament; and no act thereof can pass, unless her Majesty shall give royal assent thereunto. Touching their seditious attempts, if the bishops, or my lord chancellor, or any for them, could have proved, *de facto*, that Cartwright and his fellow-prisoners had attempted any such matters *seditiously*, then Cartwright and his fellows had been *hanged* long before this time. But her Majesty must keep a form of

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 60.

justice as well against puritans as against any other subjects, so that they may be tried in time convenient, whether they be suspected of sedition, or treason, or whatsoever name you shall give it, being puritanism or otherwise. The 9th of January, 1592."*

Sir Francis having addressed his lordship on another occasion, and, having animadverted on the arbitrary proceedings of the bishops, said, "Your lordship knows how violent the archbishop hath often been against the request of the parliament in behalf of suffering ministers, and how greatly, if not tyrannically, he hath urged subscription to his own articles, without law! The bishops are not only subject to her Majesty's supreme government, but also answerable to the counsellors of state, contrary to their unbridled claim of superiority, and contrary to their unbridled practice of urging submission to their unlawful articles."†

This religious statesman, who was a determined enemy to the superiority and oppressions of the bishops, ascertained the actual situation of the prisoners, and the severe persecution they endured. They had, indeed, endeavoured, but in the most peaceable manner, to promote a purer reformation of the Christian church, and to advance their views of ecclesiastical government, which they conceived to be agreeable to the word of God, for which they deserved universal commendation: but the zealous patrons of intolerance stigmatized this as sedition or rebellion against the state; and, if they could have proved the truth of these imputations, the prisoners would doubtless have been hanged. They could not help remembering, with the deepest sensations of gratitude, the worthy conduct of their distinguished patron. Finding that they stood in need of that advice which he had generously offered, they unitedly sent him another petition, containing the expressions of their devout thankfulness, with warm solicitation of further assistance, addressing him as "treasurer of her Majesty's household."

"It was no new thing to us, right honourable, that, at the suit of a few of us, it pleased your honour to have a care of us all, by being an honourable means to the lord treasurer for our relief. For such hath been your honourable disposition at all times, that, even of your own accord, you have been ready to further the suits of all in whom you have discerned the love of the truth. Where-

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxvi. art. 52. † Ibid. vol. lxiv. art. 32.

fore, as we hold ourselves greatly beholden to your honour, and bound to have you in all good remembrance before the Lord, so we humbly beseech your honour that, in your further care for us, we may be yet more beholden to you.

"We are advised by some of our friends presently to make our suit to the whole board of her Majesty's most honourable privy council, as being a time wherein, through extremity of weather, prisoners commonly sue, and often obtain bail. Although it standeth upon us so to do, and hope that our innocency, in the things we are charged with, is such as we may boldly enough sue for it, yet, because we were advised by your honour to stay until we had further direction from you, we thought it our duty so to do, and withal humbly to crave your honour's advice for our best way to proceed in this behalf. Thus, with our dutiful and thankful remembrance of your honourable favours towards us, we cease to trouble your honour any further, commending you to the gracious protection and blessing of God in Jesus Christ. Your honour's most humbly to command, prisoners in divers prisons in and about London."*

It does not certainly appear what effect was produced by this address, but it is extremely probable that Sir Francis recommended them to lay their distress before the lords of her Majesty's privy council; and they accordingly presented their humble petition to that honourable board. In this important document they protested their readiness to do cheerfully whatsoever her Majesty or their lordships might command, or to suffer patiently for not doing that which was contrary to their consciences.

"In most humble and dutiful manner we acknowledge ourselves to be very deeply bound, first and principally to her excellent Majesty, and after to your right honourable lordships, not only in the common duty of all subjects, but more particularly that under her Highness' so gracious and happy reign, and your lordships' provident watchfulness over this commonwealth, we have been partakers of the light of the gospel, brought up in her Majesty's schools of learning and famous universities, vouchsafed of the ministry of the word, and now of late, on her Majesty's behalf in her princely compassion tendered, touching our long and tedious

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. cix. art. 9.

were, indeed, hard times to men whose minds and consciences could not succumb to the maxims of an arbitrary system. The prisoners keenly felt that in the world they must have tribulation; but, having suffered for Christ and his cause, they not only honoured Christ, but also rejoiced to be counted worthy, and anticipated the glory to be revealed.

The case of these protestant divines was painfully interesting. Their repeated supplications and defences offered to the highest authorities, though sufficient to move any heart possessed of sympathy or humanity, were utterly unavailable; and, without being brought to an equitable trial, they continued to endure the hardship of close and miserable confinement, accompanied by heavy and increasing affliction! Those who sought to destroy the constitution, and to overthrow her Majesty's government, were released on bail; but these faithful ministers of Jesus Christ, being loyal and obedient subjects, because they refused to renounce their principles, and to degrade their consciences, could not obtain the least portion of relief, but were doomed by their right reverend persecutors to spend another dreary winter in cold and unhealthy prisons! These were not ordinary trials, especially as inflicted upon these innocent victims, and by men professing the same faith, whose tender mercy was cruelty! It ought also to be borne in mind that, at this period, comparatively few of the clergy were able to preach; but whose chief concern was to obtain high promotion and worldly wealth, and to live like drones, burdensome to the church, a disgrace to religion, and ruinous to souls! Nor, on the other hand, ought it to be forgotten that the sufferers, with deep and untiring solicitude, desired to consecrate their abilities and lives to stem the torrent of popery, and to promote the dissemination of the gospel, the best interests of the people, and the prosperity of the church of God.

CHAPTER X.

CONTINUED HARDSHIPS AND RELEASE FROM PRISON.

The foregoing affecting occurrences might have been expected when the country was deprived of the key of knowledge, and when popish darkness overspread the minds of the people; but such proceedings could hardly be supposed to exist among protestants in a protestant country. Those intolerant measures, at variance with the dictates of humanity, the principles of justice, the genius of Christianity, the honour of civilized man, and the dearest immunities of worthy subjects, were conducted by the immediate superintendence of protestant prelates, in the reign of a protestant princess! The celebrated Wycliffe, in a former age, declared that the gospel "was the perfect law of freedom and grace." In these latter days of comparative freedom, when religious liberty has begun to dawn upon the nation, and when human actions are weighed in an even balance, every honest man will view those oppressive measures as disgraceful to his country, as well as opposed to the gospel of Christ. Persecution always betrays erroneous calculation, and not only fails to obtain its favourite object, but also proves far more injurious to the persecutors than to the victims of their intolerance, too often blunting their feelings, perverting their judgments, steeling their consciences, and barbarizing their hearts!

The distressed prisoners, by their reiterated appeals to those in power, obtained no relaxation of rigorous treatment; yet one point of great importance was gained by their last application to Burghley. His lordship, moved with the hardships they endured, resolved to obtain an accurate knowledge of their condition. Having

long heard the reiterated cries of suffering humanity, sympathy and compassion moved his heart; therefore, with the view of forming a satisfactory estimate of their case, he applied to those who were best qualified to furnish him with authentic information: one of whom was an active member of the Star Chamber, and a zealous advocate of the prosecution; the other a member of that board, but a decided friend of the persecuted. By hearing what the prosecutors and the defendants had to say, he would be enabled to form an impartial judgment of the whole. His lordship, therefore, appointed the Attorney General Popham to consult the documents and proceedings relating to the prisoners, and furnish him with the result of his investigation, also with his judgment upon it. This, the attorney communicated to his lordship, December 11, 1591, stating in substance as follows:—

That, touching the case of Mr. Cartwright and his brethren, the documents were very volumnious: yet he had read nearly the whole of them and found that they had a fixed resolution to have brought into operation that form of discipline which they decidedly approved; but that, as most of them observed in their answers, they attempted to do this *only so far* as might be consistent with the *peace* of the church and the *laws* of the land. It was also concluded, in some of their assemblies, that, as their discipline could not be established by humble suit to her Majesty and the parliament, the ministers well affected to it, in various parts of the country, might induce the people to approve of it. This being done, they could have put it in practice; and, by this means, it was to be introduced. This being accomplished, they were resolved not to allow of archbishops, or bishops, and various other particulars, all of which depended upon the establishment of their discipline by her Majesty's *government!**

This information, the result of patient investigation, and derived from such high authority, could not fail to make a powerful impression on the mind of Lord Burghley. But the impartial reader will be somewhat startled at the statement of the historian, who unequivocally declares "that the prisoners meant to *overthrow* the established ecclesiastical government, and to introduce, by *force*, their own discipline!"† This foul and untrue imputation merits

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 18. † Strype's Whitgift, p. 367.

open exposure and universal abhorrence. The lord treasurer, however, sought information from both parties; and that he might be able to form an impartial estimate, he obtained a detail from one learned in the law, who is said to have been counsel to the prisoners, but who, as appears from the original document, was also a member of the Star Chamber, though his name is not mentioned. This learned person furnished the following summary of the proceedings, with his judgment upon the whole:—

He had, with great assiduity and attention, perused the writings against Mr. Cartwright and his fellow-prisoners, and he found only those things which were alleged against them in the Star Chamber at the time when the lord chancellor and the archbishop gave order that Mr. Attorney General should bring information against the prisoners. Whereas, in the attorney's information against any person in the Star Chamber, he was required to have his witnesses ready to prove the matters which he alleged, if the parties accused denied the information or any part of it. This course against Mr. Cartwright and others Mr. Attorney did not observe: although he gave strict information against them, he failed to produce any witnesses. And, for want of Mr. Attorney bringing his witnesses, the lord chancellor ordered the archbishop to appoint a doctor of divinity, and a doctor of the civil law, to be united with the attorney general for the purpose of his better information; and "even when all their wits were put together, there was no matter proved of any meeting or conventicle seditiously made and executed by Mr. Cartwright and his fellows;" and, at last, the lord chief justice of England persuaded the lord chancellor and the rest of the Star Chamber that they should not proceed against them, until they had matter to prove some seditious act, *de facto,* committed by them. "From that time to the present," he added, "the said Cartwright and his fellows have been kept in prison, without any open proceeding against them!"*

The documents with which his lordship was thus furnished, contain decisive evidence that the attorney general was unable to produce witnesses to sustain his charges. He found it very easy to accuse the prisoners of disobedience to her Majesty's laws, of convening unlawful assemblies, of holding seditious conventicles,

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 18.

of attempting to overthrow her Majesty's government, and of many other grievous offences; but he found it impossible to substantiate his charges: all his proceedings, therefore, were null and void, and the prisoners, in law and equity, stood acquitted, and ought in justice to have been released from prison. On the authority of these interesting documents, his lordship would doubtless have procured their release, but it was beyond his power; the sufferers, therefore, still remained in confinement.

The prisoners, as stated by a zealous churchman, had, to their great honour, so conducted their religious conferences "as to make no rupture in the church, and to create no danger to themselves."* Why then were they so long detained in prison? We find a certain high-toned writer, who lived in those times, being a decided patron of oppression, but having very little regard to correctness, insinuating that Mr. Cartwright and his brethren attempted to overthrow not only the liberties and privileges of the Established Church, but also the whole of the ecclesiastical state, jurisdiction and livings, the Magna Charta, and the statutes of the realm, by what they *required* of her Majesty; when, in fact, they required nothing, but merely approached their superiors with humble and dutiful petitions. This unauthenticated writer openly accused Mr. Cartwright of having taught and published "divers points of false doctrine;" and inquired whether he was not to be brought to a public recantation, for the satisfaction of those whom he had offended!† Similar to these are the statements of a modern writer, who unhesitatingly declares that the puritans "attempted to *force* their platform upon the country, in contempt of the queen's prerogative and the government of the church;" and that they "called down severities on their own heads by endeavouring to *force* their platform of discipline upon the church!"‡ How lamentable is it when respectable authors publish statements directly calculated to mislead the reader! These untrue imputations are worthy of severe animadversion.

On the adoption of the foregoing measures, Mr. Cartwright and his brethren had presented their humble petition to the lords of the council, stating their loyalty to the queen, their acknowledg-

* Heylin's Pres. p. 299. † Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 9—11.
‡ Nares' Burghley, vol. iii. p. 241, 417.

ment of her Majesty's supremacy, and the promise of their peaceable behaviour to the government of the church. This, however, gave the judges no satisfaction, since the prisoners "did not sufficiently renounce their former principles and practices!" It was irrational to require, or even to expect, such renunciation, especially as their religious principles and practices were equally their birthright as the light of the sun, and for the exercise of which they were responsible to God *alone*. The members of the Star Chamber claimed for themselves this invaluable birthright, without the least degree of human control; why then should not Mr. Cartwright and his brethren be allowed similar immunity? Have any class of men on earth the shadow of right to dictate unto others what they shall believe, and what they shall practise, in things pertaining to God and their salvation? Will any body of men, exercising sober reason, or concerned for their own credit, or professing to believe Christianity, defend the contrary principle, fraught with so much absurdity, and mischief, and flagrant intolerance? On this principle, hateful as it is, the proceedings of the High-commission and the Star Chamber were founded, being equally subversive of the rights of conscience and the religion of Christ, outraging even the authority of heaven!

The partial historian reproaches the prisoners by declaring that they gave just cause for the prince and the church to apprehend *imminent danger;* for which they were convened before the archbishop and his colleagues, when his grace administered to them the following interrogatories, demanding their respective answers:*—

"Have you, or any others to your knowledge, taught, affirmed, or allowed that, in every Christian monarchy, there ought to be certain officers who should have authority to remove or take away the Christian king from the government, or to the like effect?—Have you taught or allowed that the king is to be accounted among the governors of the church, or among those who are to be governed? And may the prince, in a well-ordered church, appoint orders and ceremonies in the church?—Do you acknowledge the ecclesiastical government, established by her Majesty, to be lawful? And do you acknowledge the sacraments ministered, as they are ordered to be ministered by the Book of Common-prayer,

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 368.

to be rightly ministered?—Have you, or any others to your knowledge, concluded that if the civil magistrate, after sufficient means used, shall refuse to admit the government by presbyteries, then the ministers may allure the people to it, they themselves practise it, and use other means to establish it?—Have you or others affirmed that it is lawful for her Majesty's subjects, by a voluntary submission, to yield to the practice of this ecclesiastical government without her Majesty's assent?—Have any censures, mentioned in the book of discipline, been put in practice? How? when? and by whom?—Do you know, or have you credibly heard, that any person hath been tried, examined, elected, ordained, or allowed to be a minister, pastor, or doctor, by any assembly, according to any part of the said book?—Have you, or any other of whom you have heard, put in practice the power and authority of an eldership, or some part thereof, by or under the name of pastors and doctors?—How far have you taught or affirmed that, without the breach of the peace, any ministers or subjects voluntarily assembled, and not licensed by her Highness, may treat of laws to be altered?—Have you had any other ordination or approbation to the ministry than by some bishop?—Have you, or any other to your knowledge, treated upon certain means of maintenance for bare reading ministers, and of thrusting forth archbishops, bishops, deans, and other officers ecclesiastical? and how they should be provided for, that the commonwealth might not be pestered with beggars? and what means of provisions for them, and of thrusting them out, were thought of, or propounded as fit to be used?—Have you, or any other to your knowledge, or by your procurement, advanced, approved, or set forth the manner of government ecclesiastical described in the book of discipline, or any part thereof?—Have you, or any other, impugned, spoken against, or opposed the government ecclesiastical, form of Common-prayer, or administration of sacraments, exercised under her Majesty's authority in this realm?—Have you moved or persuaded others to refuse the oath before the commissioners ecclesiastical?"

In reply to these interrogatories, Mr. Lord and Mr. Wright confessed that they had moved others to refuse the oath, and were required to acknowledge their fault. But their answers to the interrogatories were expressed with becoming circumspection, re-

fusing to bring themselves and each other into further danger. Mr. Cartwright was required to acknowledge himself guilty of a grievous offence by having subscribed the book of discipline, on which he referred to that which was stated in their most humble petition to their lordships as the whole of what he was warranted to answer. This he most humbly prayed their lordships to accept in good part; but, if that would not satisfy them, he humbly submitted to the punishment which her Majesty or their lordships should think proper to inflict, humbly praying that his long and tedious imprisonment, with its manifold inconveniences, might, in honourable and Christian compassion, be tenderly considered.

Messrs. Fenn, Lord, Wight, and King answered in effect the same as Mr. Cartwright; but Mr. Proudlove, who had not subscribed the book, said he could not confess any fault while he denied the fact charged against him. He had not, to the best of his knowledge, subscribed the book. He had sometimes assembled in conference with certain neighbouring ministers; but this was perfectly voluntary, and not by any bond of subscription or promise. He declared that the meetings were not according to the book of discipline. As to other things, he knew not what they were, nor could he say any thing unless the particulars were set down; nevertheless, now finding that to meet in conference, in such manner as prescribed in the book of discipline, was disliked by her Majesty and their lordships, he promised that he would not hereafter meet in conference, according to that which he had set down in their general submission and petition already exhibited to their honours. Mr. Snape said he had not subscribed the book of discipline, nor the articles annexed, nor, by the supposed subscription, promised to observe the meetings prescribed in that book, to the utmost of his remembrance, as he had already deposed. For further answer, he humbly referred himself to that which was contained in a petition exhibited by himself and others to their lordships.*

The prisoners, so grievously harassed and perplexed by this protestant inquisition, still maintained their uncompromising steadfastness, and refused to answer the interrogatories under the cruel oath; yet other puritan divines concluded that, when examined before their spiritual judges, it was their duty to confess all that

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 62.

they knew. These were Messrs. Henry Alvey, Thomas Edmunds, William Perkins, Edmund Littleton, John Johnson, Thomas Barber, Hercules Cleavely, Anthony Nutter, and Thomas Stone, who took the oath, and discovered numerous particulars relating to the greater and lesser associations. Mr. Stone was examined in the Star Chamber, from six o'clock in the morning till seven in the evening, and required on oath to furnish answers to *thirty-three* articles. His examination chiefly related to their religious meetings; and, though he could not furnish a direct answer to all the interrogatories proposed to him, yet he gave an account of the greater and lesser assemblies, where they met, how often, and what persons officiated. He answered certain questions concerning the authority by which they were convened, who were moderators, what points they discussed, and certain other proceedings.*

Mr. Stone also deposed that Mr. Cartwright and others assembled, a little before his commitment, in conference at Mr. Gardiner's house, where they consulted about a petition to her Majesty for the restoration of ministers confined in prison; also whether Mr. Cartwright might make known what had passed at previous meetings. He said that Mr. Cartwright, with others, had assembled about the trial of the treatise of discipline, and concerning three petitions, one to her Majesty, another to the parliament, and a third to the bishops, that, by her Majesty's authority, the said discipline might be established. He confessed that a meeting had been held by Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Snape, and others, at Cambridge, when the treatise of discipline was perfected, and a voluntary subscription to it agreed upon. He also made known that, on various occasions, Messrs. Snape, King, Proudlove, Johnson, Littleton, and others had assembled for conference in Mr. Johnson's house, at Northampton, concerning subscription to the discipline; but that it was to be advanced by lawful and peaceable means, with her Majesty's authority. They also there considered the propriety of presenting three petitions; and he said they assembled together by letter or message, without any other calling.

Mr. Alvey, being called, said he could not depose, seeing he

* Fuller, b. ix. p. 207—209.

had never been present with the defendants or any others at any of the conferences in question. The others, having taken the oath, were examined on a great number of interrogatories; but they are so tedious, so multifarious, and so disgusting, that it will be proper to state only those which appertain to the subject of this memoir.

Mr. Barber deposed that Mr. Cartwright and others had assembled at Cambridge to consult about obtaining the establishment of church discipline by her Majesty's authority; also to consider whether non-preaching ministers were ministers of Christ, and whether the sacraments might be received at their hands: but these questions were not concluded. The same defendants assembled in London, and were of opinion that homilies and the apocrypha ought not to be read in the churches. They further considered that there ought to be no superiority in church government; that the calling and jurisdiction of lord-bishops were unlawful; that the proposed discipline was to be taught with modesty, on all proper occasions, from the text, and as part of the gospel: but they concluded none of these points, only giving their private opinions. They debated whether the subscription required by the bishops was unlawful, and whether the treatise of discipline was agreeable to the word of God. They considered by what means the schism of the papists and Brownists might be most properly corrected and suppressed; and the propriety of presenting supplications to her Majesty, the council, and the bishops, for the relief of ministers from suspension, deprivation, and imprisonment. He also observed that they had assembled by letter or message, without any other calling; and he understood that similar meetings had been held at Oxford and Warwick: but he named neither the persons who assembled nor the object of their meeting.

Mr. Cleavely deposed that Mr. Cartwright and others had assembled in conference at Warwick and Coventry, by a voluntary consent, and they conferred how the treatise of discipline might be established by lawful authority. Mr. Nutter deposed that Messrs. Cartwright, Fenn, Lord, Wight, and others had assembled in conference at Warwick and Coventry concerning the proposed discipline and the furtherance of their public ministry;

but that these meetings were voluntary, and called only by letter or message addressed to the parties. Mr. Perkins deposed that Mr. Cartwright and others had assembled in conference at St. John's college, Cambridge, to consult on the discipline in question.*

Notwithstanding the long train of particulars, of which the reader is here furnished with a specimen, the inquisitors obtained no signal conquest over their victims. Many particular circumstances were made known concerning their religious conferences and the proposed discipline; but nothing was discovered savouring of faction, sedition, or hostility to the government. It was extremely manifest from the numerous inquiries, not only that the prisoners had endeavoured to obtain a purer reformation, for which they deserved universal commendation, but also that they sought it in the quiet and peaceable use of just and honourable means. Why then should they be punished for such praiseworthy conduct? The object at which they aimed, as well as the means they employed, will be applauded by all persons of sober judgment and sound piety, so long as men have courage and honesty to claim the birthright of man. Their persecutors exercised all the wit and inquisition they possessed to prove that they had "seditiously, and by force," attempted to establish their views of ecclesiastical government; but their attempt proved an absolute failure.

The prisoners, having been interrogated on one occasion, deposed that none of the defendants had allowed or favoured the separation of the Brownists, but had recommended the recovery of such as had withdrawn from the church, and the stay of those who were in danger of being seduced. They again denied that they ever intended to introduce the discipline *by force,* or in any way inconsistent with the conduct of dutiful subjects and the peace of society. They also declared, concerning the religious conferences, that they had assembled by a free and voluntary consent, as appeared best suited to their several conditions and circumstances, and that they had no intention whatever to enforce their views without the authority of her Majesty and the parliament.

When further pressed to divulge the object of their meetings,

* Strype's Whitgift, Appen. p. 159—164.

they declared that they had discussed nothing but what was honest and dutiful to her Majesty's person and authority. They had supplicated her Majesty, the parliament, the council, the convocation and the bishops; and considered how they might satisfy authority in the fear of God on the subscription and use of the Book of Common-prayer, with their advancement in good learning and sound religion. They also declared that they had not adopted any order contrary to law; and they denied that they had agreed to use any other form of prayer than that which was established by law, until the same should be allowed by her Majesty and the parliament, nor did they know that any of them ever practised such form of prayer; and they also denied that any order for communicants to subscribe the discipline was agreed to be practised before it was established by lawful authority.

They, moreover, denied that they ever elected, ordained, or confirmed any minister, elder, or deacon, or that they exercised the authority of the eldership, or censured any person by any suspension, excommunication, or civil punishment whatsoever, or that they made or received any appeals from lesser to greater assemblies. They declared that they never knew any of the defendants to persuade any persons to forsake their calling in the Church of England, nor to dissuade any persons from appearing in the ecclesiastical courts, nor to do any thing in the execution of their ministry contrary to the inhibition of those in authority. They denied that the defendants ever treated of *civil* matters, the administration of which they undoubtedly believed appertained wholly to the civil magistrate; and they declared that the defendants had recommended that the discipline should be taught without any unbecoming reflections on any order already established. They affirmed and deposed that the defendants were so far from making separation and despising authority and things established that they disallowed the writings of Martin Mar-prelate; and that none of the defendants, to their knowledge, had allured or persuaded any persons to practise the discipline, without the assent of the civil magistrate.*

The intelligent reader will easily perceive how far these depositions acquitted the prisoners, especially of the principal accusations brought against them. The prisoners were, however, accused of

* Strype's Whitgift, Appen. p. 165, 166.

having engaged in "a confederacy for bringing a new government into the church," in which Mr. Cartwright was denominated the "principal actor." He therefore underwent a separate examination, and was thus interrogated:—

Whether he had taught or maintained that the king was to be accounted governor of the church, or one to be governed? and whether the prince might appoint orders and ceremonies in the church? Whether he acknowledged the ecclesiastical government, established by her Majesty, to be lawful and allowable by the word of God? Whether the sacraments as appointed to be ministered by the Book of Common-prayer were godly and rightly ministered? Whether the ministers and people of England who dislike the church government by presbyteries were to be accounted Christian brethren in the same sense as those who labour to promote that government? And whether he had taught and affirmed that those churches of England which impugn the presbyterian discipline and government were to be accounted as true churches as those which had submitted to the government by presbyteries? How many assemblies, provincial or general, had he attended? Whether he, or any others to his knowledge, had treated or proposed certain maintenance of bare reading ministers, or of thrusting out archbishops, bishops, deans, and other ecclesiastical officers? and how they should be provided for, that the commonwealth might not be pestered with beggars? Whether he, or any other by his procurement, had, by writing or teaching, advanced or set forth the manner of ecclesiastical government contained in the book of discipline, or any part thereof? And whether he or any other had impugned or opposed the ecclesiastical government, or the administration of the sacraments, as set forth by her Majesty's authority?*

Mr. Cartwright is said to have refused to answer these interrogatories, yet to have confessed that he had subscribed and submitted to the book of discipline; also that he had put the said book in execution, both in the order of preaching and of meetings. The comment on the book of discipline is that it attributed the whole ecclesiastical government to pastors, doctors, and elders, according to the word of God; so that the Christian prince was not once mentioned, but excluded from all ecclesiastical pre-eminence, and was

* Harleian MSS. vol. 6849, p. 254.

made subject to excommunication and other censures of the eldership! Mr. Cartwright is further accused of having assembled with his brethren in London; and that they concluded, as already stated, that homilies and apocryphal writings were not to be read in the churches.*

At this crisis, the house of commons espoused the cause of the suffering ministers. Notwithstanding her Majesty's disgusting treatment of the commons, as briefly noticed, many distinguished members ventured to defend the rights and liberties of Christian churches. The proceedings against learned and worthy ministers by subscription and inquisition were denounced as "contrary to the honour of God, the regality of her Majesty, the laws of the realm, and the liberty of the subjects, compelling them upon their oaths to accuse themselves in their own private actions, words, and thoughts," not knowing what questions they would be required to answer till after they had sworn! If they refused to take the infamous oath, they were deprived, degraded, or committed to prison, and detained during the pleasure of their persecutors. To obtain a redress of these enormities, two bills were offered to the house: one against inquisitions, subscriptions, and the oath *ex officio;* the other against the illegal imprisonment of those who refused this scandalous oath. This bill was firmly supported by Sir Francis Knollys and other distinguished members, who considered the measure as well calculated to effect a reformation of abuses and to restrain the oppressive power of the prelates.

The debates on this bill roused the indignation of the queen, who sent for the speaker, and commanded him to remind the house that they were not to meddle with either matters of *state* or causes *ecclesiastical;* that she wondered they should attempt a thing contrary to her commandment; that she was highly offended with their conduct; and that it was her royal pleasure that no bill relating to any matters of state and causes ecclesiastical should be there exhibited! Mr. Morrice, who introduced the bill, said, "My religion towards God, my allegiance to her Majesty, and the many oaths I have taken to maintain her supremacy, cause me to offer to your consideration certain matters concerning the sacred Majesty of God, the prerogative and supremacy of the queen, the privileges of the

* Harleian MSS. vol. 6849, p. 254.

laws, and the liabilities of us all." For this bold adventure, he was seized in the house by a sergeant at arms, discharged from his office in the court of the duchy of Lancaster, disabled from his practice as a barrister at law, and sent a prisoner to Tutbury Castle, where he remained some years! * †

Notwithstanding these authenticated facts, Queen Elizabeth is said to have always treated her subjects "graciously," that she ruled them with "all mildness and moderation," and that she brought her subjects, "by gentle means, to yield unto her just and profitable demands rather than enforce them by rigour and authority!" ‡ These, it must be acknowledged, were trying times; and it was matter of deep lamentation that the foregoing worthy efforts were unavailing. It was also perfectly natural that fallacious and degrading imputations were cast upon the persecuted. Mr. Cartwright was even accused of an intention to excommunicate the queen; whereas the thought of such design had never entered his mind. The reputation of the best of men might be ruined by such misrepresentation. These untrue reports were industriously circulated at court, where most persons were too much disposed to believe them, and they were intended to keep alive her Majesty's displeasure against the prisoner; but, to counteract their degrading influence, he addressed a letter to his kind friend Lord Gray, dated January 15, 1592, from which it appears that several of the prisoners were allowed, or rather promised, the liberty of going out of prison, under certain restrictions. This encouraged Mr. Cartwright to make intercession for similar benefit.

He had long been an humble suitor to his lordship that, by his honourable mediation, he might obtain some relief from long and tedious imprisonment; he therefore again earnestly entreated that

* D'Ewes, p. 474; Townsend, p. 61, 63; Heylin's Pres. p. 320. † Mr. Morrice, having lain some time in prison, addressed a letter to Lord Burghley, dated March 1, 1592; and, having declared his principles and his innocence, he stated the course adopted by the ruling ecclesiastics. "I thought that the judges ecclesiastical, who were charged in the great council of the realm to be dishonourers of God and of her Majesty, violators and perverters of law and public justice, and wrong doers unto the liberties and freedoms of all her Majesty's subjects, by their extorted oaths, wrongful imprisonments, lawless subscription, and unjust absolutions, would rather have sought means to be cleared of this weighty accusation than to shrowd themselves under the suppressing of the complaint and the shadow of mine imprisonment!"—*Lodge's Illustration*, vol. iii. p. 34.

‡ Paule's Whitgift, p. 81.

it would please his lordship, for the better furtherance of this request, to understand that his fellow-prisoners in the Clink and White Lion had obtained from his grace of Canterbury this liberty, by their own bond of forty pounds, on the condition of returning to their prisons at night. They might also go to church on the Sabbath-day; and such as alleged special cause of business might go abroad any other day of the week, particularly Mr. Fenn and Mr. King. Mr. Cartwright understood that misinformation had been carried against him, that he had written undutifully touching the excommunication of her Majesty, and that he was involved in a plot for the execution of it; he therefore beseeched his lordship to notice the true answer to as unjust an accusation as ever man devised against man. He unfeignedly protested to his lordship, in the presence of Almighty God, the Searcher of all hearts, that he was so far from being a party, or at all privy to any such execution, that such a thing had never entered his thoughts.

He further reminded his lordship that, how meanly soever his enemies might consider his discretion, he was assured the charge could never be proved, from any expression or writing of his, that he had undutifully, or in any unseemly manner, treated at any time of excommunication, or even applied it to any prince, much less to her Majesty's royal person. When this private surmise should be examined, and he most humbly desired it might be sifted to the uttermost, he was assured it would be found to have no more truth in it than the accusation that he had renounced his ministry and taken a new ministry, according to Martin's libel; but he, on the contrary, had maintained his ministry against certain exceptions, and was ever an enemy to Martin's disorderly course.

The doctrine of excommunication which he taught, either by preaching or writing, was not a singular opinion, but the same as that of the universal church of God, and particularly that which the Church of England then allowed, and had always allowed, as more fully declared in their humble supplication presented to her Majesty, except in the excommunication of the Emperor Theodosius. This he maintained was neither done, nor ought to be done, by any one man, Ambrose or other, but by synod or council. His grace of Canterbury affirmed it to have been done by Ambrose

alone; yea, and set forth the commendation, as may appear from his books. Other difference he knew none. He therefore humbly implored his lordship, as to his wisdom should seem most convenient, to use his honourable means for obtaining his liberty or bail, for the relief of his heavy affliction, and for minding such business as required his attention, and which greatly concerned both his own estate and that of his friends, especially the hospital, whereof he had charge, and which was variously defrauded by men who took away its endowments.*

The reader here beholds the lamentable position in which Mr. Cartwright was placed; and, in addition to other grievances, foul and untrue imputations were heaped upon him. Ten days after the last petition, and most probably before he received any answer, he sent the following short letter to Lord Burghley:—

"My duty most humbly and thankfully remembered to your lordship, trusting upon your wisdom, which is not ignorant of the heart of a prisoner. I am bold once again to desire your honourable favour, for the relief which may seem good to your lordship, in the causes which I laid down in my last letter. I made known to your lordship the cause why hitherto I forbore to make suit unto his grace; namely, that, in my lord chancellor's life, he denied me that favour which he granted to others of my fellows in the same cause. Howbeit, if your lordship shall think my suit unto him to be my way, I have prepared my petition, which I will either prefer or forbear, as I may understand your lordship's pleasure therein. Thus, with acknowledgment of my bounden duty for your honourable favour from time to time, and most humbly desire the continuance of the same, I most dutifully commend your lordship, for increase of all piety and honour, to the gracious keeping and blessing of God in Jesus Christ. From the Fleet, the 25th of January, 1592. Your lordship's most humbly to command."†

It does not appear what advice his lordship gave in reply to this request; but it seems probable that, on the recommendation of Burghley, the prisoner sent a petition to the archbishop. The melancholy prospect, in a short time, seemed to brighten, and Mr. Cartwright obtained the promise of some mitigation of his

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxix. art. 40. † Ibid. art. 41.

sufferings. This he informed the lord treasurer by letter, from which it appears that Archbishop Whitgift had *promised* him the liberty of going out of prison one day in the week, in addition to the Sabbath, except in the time of term, the other prisoners being allowed this favour without limitation; all of which was happily promoted by the treasurer's generous intercession. Mr. Cartwright, it appears, addressed a separate petition to the archbishop, humbly imploring his favourable attention to his distressed condition; and it was probably presented by Mrs. Cartwright, when his grace treated her with greater civility than on a former occasion. This petition we have not seen. Had it not been for certain untrue reports, prejudicial to Mr. Cartwright's character, which had reached the ears of the council, he probably might have obtained entire release from prison. This appears from his address presented at this crisis to Lord Burghley.

In this application to his lordship, he observed that the mere expression of thanks, consisting only of words, would be of no avail with his lordship, but only an hinderance to his weightier affairs. He therefore preferred exercising himself in daily prayer to Almighty God for the recompense of his gracious blessings, as might best suit his honourable estate, especially as might best prepare him for a comfortable appearance and account of his great stewardship before the Son of God, the judge of all the world. By his lordship's honourable interposition, having previously prepared the archbishop, he had obtained the same favour in his own affairs and the hospital's which the other prisoners had for themselves alone, which was the liberty of going out one day in the week, besides the Sabbath, as already stated. He informed his lordship that the archbishop had treated Mrs. Cartwright with courtesy, and addressed her with such favourable words as raised some hope, either of an entire discharge, or of obtaining this or similar relief. But, to prevent the least relaxation of his sufferings, he had been made to understand that a grievous complaint had been carried to her Majesty's council of one who, in his prayers with the poor men of the hospital, had uttered undutiful words against the council, the magistrates, and the judges of the realm. The truth of the case was this: that the man in question was forward to show his opinion on points of controversy; and, being a person of slender

attainments, Mr. Cartwright could easily conceive that indiscreet expressions might fall from his lips. He submitted, however, to his lordship's grave consideration, whether this matter might not have been settled at Warwick, without bringing it to so great a presence, had there not been a purpose to thrust at him, and by this stroke to have preferred Mr. Bourman, who had already a benefice of one hundred pounds a-year at Allchurch, which was united with the vicarage of Warwick; and he anticipated, from the intimation of certain notable persons, that the hospital would be united to those benefices.

The enemies of Mr. Cartwright did not fail to cast the reproach of this story upon him, as done by the man whom he had employed and whom he had trained to this indiscretion; but, to refute this aspersion, and set the matter right, he wished his lordship to understand that, whatever words the man had uttered, it had not been in the least with his allowance. This would appear from the fact that, for the space of six years, he had daily prayed with the family twice or thrice a-day; yet he was able to prove that, during all that time, neither he nor any other could ever learn any such thing from his example. His man he was not. He had, indeed, married a maid out of his house, who had served him above a dozen years; and Mrs. Cartwright, going up to London, intrusted to her the care of the house and gardens, with which she was best acquainted. And, because the man had to lodge in the house with his wife, she desired him to exercise in the daily prayers of the household; so the man could not, without injustice, be considered as his servant.

Mr. Cartwright further reminded his lordship that, having heard that he had continued the prayers to so unusual a length that the poor old men could not attend the service of the church, he had given him warning to amend his fault, or he should be dismissed. He had heard of the case under consideration only two days before this application, and he had already sent to discharge him, that he should no more exercise in the prayers nor in the government of the house. He intended to have complained of the extraordinary measures which had been adopted to bring him into hatred; but his necessary answer to this matter had so extended his communication that he dare not enter on the subject. Wherefore,

having most humbly craved the continuance of his lordship's lawful favour, he commended his lordship to the gracious keeping and blessing of God. From the Fleet, the 31st of January, 1592.*

The reader must be aware that any impropriety in the man whom Mrs. Cartwright permitted to conduct the devotions of the family could not with any degree of justice be charged against her husband; but this occurrence transpired at an unseasonable juncture, when he was seeking and hoping to be released from confinement. How far these unpropitious events might operate to his disadvantage, it is difficult now to ascertain: only it is very evident that he continued several months longer to inhabit his dreary abode in the Fleet.

Mr. Cartwright, only two days after the date last mentioned, addressed an epistle to "his loving friend Mr. Hicks." On a former occasion, and in a season of deep anxiety, he had received a valuable present from the generous secretary, as related in a former part of this narrative; but, on this occasion, Mr. Cartwright sent him certain papers, containing answers to the accusations brought against him and his brethren, requesting him to deliver them to the lord treasurer the first convenient opportunity. He accompanied these documents with an account of the sufferings he had endured. He had first transmitted to his lordship a brief account of their cause generally, containing answers to the charges of the greatest moment, which he requested him to deliver to his lordship as it might seem most convenient to him; only he desired Mr. Hicks to embrace the most favourable opportunity, so as to be the least incumbrance to his lordship, and best fitted to move him to examine and promote this cause; and he doubted not that his lordship would commiserate him in this long and tedious imprisonment, which he had endured nearly one year and a half.

The distressed prisoner also complained of the expenses attending his long confinement; and that the charges of obtaining copies of his depositions, in addition to the fees of the counsel, which, though excessive, he could not fail to offer. In compliance with the recommendation of friends, he purposed taking physic in the spring of this year, on account of the various afflictions under which he laboured, the danger of which had been so much in-

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxix. art. 42.

creased, by having been thrust into an unhealthy prison, that the physicians refused to administer any more during this restraint. Though his suit overbalanced any acquaintance, or any other cause in himself, yet, not wishing to be evil thought of, he sought that assistance and redress in the love he bore to him, which would prove of greatest interest unto his lordship. He concluded by expressing his dutiful remembrance to Mr. Hicks; and, ceasing any further to trouble him, he committed him to the gracious keeping and blessing of God in Jesus Christ. From the Fleet, February 2, 1592.*

The extreme sufferings of the persecuted, at length, awakened the sympathy and compassion of certain distinguished personages. The solicitude of Sir Francis Knollys and of the lord treasurer to procure a relaxation of their sufferings, or their release from prison, has been already noticed. At this painful crisis, eminent scholars and divines testified similar concern for their distressed brethren, who, instead of being deprived of their livings, and confined within the walls of dreary prisons, ought, in their opinion, to have been actively employed in their beloved work of preaching the gospel, stemming the progress of popery, advancing the kingdom of Christ, and promoting the salvation of souls. The oppressive treatment of so many learned and useful ministers was a reproach to a protestant country and a free government, and a standing monument of ignominy and disgust to posterity. At this juncture, therefore, several of the principal heads of the university of Cambridge presented their supplication to the lord treasurer in favour of the prisoners, declaring that "divers true friends and lovers of the gospel," who conducted themselves in "dutiful and peaceable" behaviour, had been treated with greater "severity than many known papists!" They made application to his lordship to stir up his "sincere mind" to press forwards in "God's cause," in assured expectation of his blessing; and they trusted that the Lord, in due time, and by his instrumentality, would accomplish the desired objects. By his "wise care and godly zeal" relief and comfort would be secured to "the true and peaceable professors of the gospel;" by which "God would be glorified by the thanksgiving

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxix. art. 44.

of many," and his lordship would obtain "much Christian honour, and much peace and comfort in old age."*

This supplication, breathing a most catholic and pious spirit, was subscribed by Dr. Goad, Dr. Whitaker, Dr. Barwell, and Mr. Chadderton, all distinguished heads of the university, and famous in their generation; but their generous interference was unavailing. The prisoners having remained in severe confinement, at length, resolved to present their humble petition to Archbishop Whitgift; but, if we may credit the testimony of churchmen, they had no flattering prospect of success. "This was the constant custom of Whitgift," says one of these writers, "if any lord or lady sued to him to show favour to any nonconformists, he would profess how glad he was to serve them, and gratify their desires, assuring them for his part, all possible kindness should be indulged unto them; but he would remit nothing of his rigour against them! Thus he never *denied* any great man's desire, and yet never *granted* it, pleasing them with general promises, but still keeping his own resolution; whereupon the nobility ceased making any more suits unto him, knowing them to be ineffectual." Another churchman reminds us that he treated the lords of the council in a tone of extreme haughtiness, using this language: "What tellest thou me of the lords of the council? I tell thee they are in these cases to be advised by us, and not we by them!"†

What encouragement could the prisoners have in approaching a man who assumed these disgusting pretensions, and over whose heads he held the rod of archiepiscopal discipline? Under these discouraging prospects, they were aware that no relief could be obtained without the allowance or consent of his grace of Canterbury; therefore, notwithstanding the gloomy prospect, the prisoners jointly ventured to lay their affecting case, with their humble supplication, at the feet of the archbishop. In their joint address to his grace, they declared that, on their most humble suit to her Majesty's most honourable privy council, they had received, as from others of that most honourable board, so also from his grace, a comfortable answer of speedy deliverance from this long and tedious imprisonment; but, having waited in hope and expectation

* Strype's Whitgift, Appen. p. 156. † Fuller, b. ix. p. 218; Paule's Whitgift, p. 101.

of it some convenient time, they were again constrained, by the manifold and grievous afflictions which they and their families sustained, to renew their humble suit for bail, until such time as his grace and the rest of their honours should determine their cause depending before them. They therefore most humbly craved his grace's lawful favour and furtherance, as one of principal concern in their cause, both on account of their calling to the ministry and of the ecclesiastical matters in question. They trusted that his grace would be disposed to hearken to this their humble suit, from the recollection that, although they were of different judgment in some ecclesiastical controversies, they had not alienated, nor meant to alienate, their affections from the holy fellowship of the church of God, in which his grace and others of the same mind remained. They then concluded by expressing their hope to receive a comfortable answer, for their release from their long and heavy restraint; and they humbly commended his lordship to the merciful direction and blessing of Almighty God.*

The result of this application was as favourable as they had any reason to anticipate.† In reply, this protestant prelate was pleased to signify that they should be released on bail, on condition of renouncing their principles and their religious assemblies as unlawful and seditious, by subscribing the following recantation:—

"We whose names are subscribed, each man for himself, do unfeignedly acknowledge and confess that all jurisdiction, privilege, and superiority, which by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority *heretofore have been,* or lawfully may, by the laws of this realm, be exercised or used, for the visitation, reformation, and correction of the ecclesiastical state, or persons within her Majesty's dominions, and for the reformation and correction of all errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities within the same, are united to the imperial Crown of England; and that her Majesty hath the *same power* and *authority,* so united to the crown, as well by *God's law* as by the laws and statutes of this realm.

"That, by God's laws and the laws of this realm, there ought not to be any synods, conventicles, or assemblies for the concluding or establishing of any laws, articles, ordinances, or constitutions

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 44. † Ibid. vol. 983, p. 41.

to be exercised, used, or put in use within this realm, in any spiritual or ecclesiastical matters or causes, or over any persons whatsoever, otherwise than by the Queen's Majesty's assent, or by virtue of her Highness' authority. And that all synods, conventicles, assemblies, and attempts for any innovation or alteration to be made within this realm, without her Majesty's authority or assent, of any ecclesiastical laws or government, are *seditious* and unlawful. Also that the ecclesiastical government, now received and established by her Majesty's authority in the Church of England, is lawful and allowable by the word of God. And that the government challenged, devised, or attempted to be executed by any presbyteries or church assembly, consisting of doctors, pastors, elder, and deacons, or of any of them, or of any such like, not warranted by the laws of this realm, is not only unlawful, but also *very dangerous for the state of this realm!*

"We do likewise acknowledge that it is *seditious* and *ungodly* to teach or maintain that there ought to be any potentate, officers, magistrates, or any such as affirm or take upon them to be a presbytery or consistory, or any other persons, of whatsoever quality or degree, that hath or ought to have any power to excommunicate, remove, or deprive her Majesty, for *any cause whatsoever*, or to command her Majesty's subjects to withdraw their obedience from her. We also acknowledge the Church of England, now established by the laws of England, to be a true member of the true church of Christ; and that the sacraments ministered, as they be ordained by the law to be ministered, are godly and rightly ministered, and the whole order of public prayer and ceremonies therein by law established to be such as no man ought therefore to make any schism, division, or contention in the church, or to withdraw himself from the same."*

It is difficult to suppress indignation at the recital of this document, which added insult to injury. The opinion went abroad that Whitgift was the most mischievous prelate that ever sate on the "cogging stool" of Canterbury: more ambitious than Wolsey; more proud than Gardiner; more tyrannical than Bonner.† And we are reminded by a zealous churchman that the wisest of her Majesty's councillers had ample reason to regret his high eleva-

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 370, Appen. p. 153. † Hanbury, vol. i. p. 38.

of it some convenient time, they were again constrained, by the manifold and grievous afflictions which they and their families sustained, to renew their humble suit for bail, until such time as his grace and the rest of their honours should determine their cause depending before them. They therefore most humbly craved his grace's lawful favour and furtherance, as one of principal concern in their cause, both on account of their calling to the ministry and of the ecclesiastical matters in question. They trusted that his grace would be disposed to hearken to this their humble suit, from the recollection that, although they were of different judgment in some ecclesiastical controversies, they had not alienated, nor meant to alienate, their affections from the holy fellowship of the church of God, in which his grace and others of the same mind remained. They then concluded by expressing their hope to receive a comfortable answer, for their release from their long and heavy restraint; and they humbly commended his lordship to the merciful direction and blessing of Almighty God.*

The result of this application was as favourable as they had any reason to anticipate.† In reply, this protestant prelate was pleased to signify that they should be released on bail, on condition of renouncing their principles and their religious assemblies as unlawful and seditious, by subscribing the following recantation:—

"We whose names are subscribed, each man for himself, do unfeignedly acknowledge and confess that all jurisdiction, privilege, and superiority, which by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority *heretofore have been*, or lawfully may, by the laws of this realm, be exercised or used, for the visitation, reformation, and correction of the ecclesiastical state, or persons within her Majesty's dominions, and for the reformation and correction of all errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities within the same, are united to the imperial Crown of England; and that her Majesty hath the *same power* and *authority*, so united to the crown, as well by *God's law* as by the laws and statutes of this realm.

"That, by God's laws and the laws of this realm, there ought not to be any synods, conventicles, or assemblies for the concluding or establishing of any laws, articles, ordinances, or constitutions

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxviii. art. 44. † Ibid. vol. 983, p. 41.

to be exercised, used, or put in use within this realm, in any spiritual or ecclesiastical matters or causes, or over any persons whatsoever, otherwise than by the Queen's Majesty's assent, or by virtue of her Highness' authority. And that all synods, conventicles, assemblies, and attempts for any innovation or alteration to be made within this realm, without her Majesty's authority or assent, of any ecclesiastical laws or government, are *seditious* and unlawful. Also that the ecclesiastical government, now received and established by her Majesty's authority in the Church of England, is lawful and allowable by the word of God. And that the government challenged, devised, or attempted to be executed by any presbyteries or church assembly, consisting of doctors, pastors, elder, and deacons, or of any of them, or of any such like, not warranted by the laws of this realm, is not only unlawful, but also *very dangerous for the state of this realm!*

"We do likewise acknowledge that it is *seditious* and *ungodly* to teach or maintain that there ought to be any potentate, officers, magistrates, or any such as affirm or take upon them to be a presbytery or consistory, or any other persons, of whatsoever quality or degree, that hath or ought to have any power to excommunicate, remove, or deprive her Majesty, for *any cause whatsoever*, or to command her Majesty's subjects to withdraw their obedience from her. We also acknowledge the Church of England, now established by the laws of England, to be a true member of the true church of Christ; and that the sacraments ministered, as they be ordained by the law to be ministered, are godly and rightly ministered, and the whole order of public prayer and ceremonies therein by law established to be such as no man ought therefore to make any schism, division, or contention in the church, or to withdraw himself from the same."*

It is difficult to suppress indignation at the recital of this document, which added insult to injury. The opinion went abroad that Whitgift was the most mischievous prelate that ever sate on the "cogging stool" of Canterbury: more ambitious than Wolsey; more proud than Gardiner; more tyrannical than Bonner.† And we are reminded by a zealous churchman that the wisest of her Majesty's councillers had ample reason to regret his high eleva-

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 370, Appen. p. 153. † Hanbury, vol. i. p. 38.

tion!* The lofty prelate, having ecclesiastical emoluments in one hand and the sword of the magistrate in the other, and having the support of the crown and the penal laws, found no difficulty in demanding this odious recantation from the prisoners. If the persecuted, at the commencement of their troubles, could have degraded their judgments, and insulted their consciences, they would have saved themselves from this long train of evils. The form of recantation furnishes a specimen of that despotism which is not always so prominent in the history of persecutors, but which the prelates of this period manifestly exercised over the servants of God. To have subscribed this odious document, they must have debased themselves below the character of rational beings. Could the Church of Rome have assumed loftier pretensions or exercised fouler despotism? Had the archbishop actually possessed the infallibility arrogantly claimed by the pope, he could not have required more. But, to reject infallibility, and still require rational men to acknowledge that all jurisdiction and authority which had heretofore been exercised, was requiring them to ascribe the same ecclesiastical domination to the Queen of England as the pope had so outrageously usurped when he rode triumphant on the necks of princes and the people! These arrogant claims not only betrayed the grossest ignorance and absurdity, but also breathed the very spirit of antichrist. Notwithstanding these glaring facts, it has been declared "that Whitgift always governed with great prudence and moderation!" that his carriage was exceedingly mild and temperate, and that he endeavoured to win the puritans by gentle persuasion and kind usage rather than by the use of sharp censure! And it is added that "all along he treated Mr. Cartwright with *lenity*, thinking that, when his enthusiasm subsided, he would become well-affected towards the church!"† What man can credit statements so contrary to the clearest facts?

May it not be asked, who invested Archbishop Whitgift with the high prerogative of prescribing and requiring the foregoing recantation? Did not he exact more than was due to him or to any creature on earth or in heaven? Is not every man personally

* Soames' Elizabeth, p. 370.

† Cunningham's Lives, vol. ii. p. 215; Paule's Whitgift, p. 79; Lawson's Laud, vol. i. p. 45.

endowed by his Creator with an undoubted right to think and decide for himself on all questions relating to religion? Was not his grace of Canterbury himself responsible to God in all these matters? How then could he make the haughty claim, without usurping the prerogative of Deity? To have said that he received his authority from the queen would have been an insult to her Majesty and an outrage on Christianity. In all such cases, the command of God constituted the only authority and rule; so there could be no scope for human assumption. And, as sacred principle, not expediency, not inclination, not tradition, formed the rule of obedience, so the prisoners ought to have been moved by the powerful influence of inspired truth. The assumption of power to force religion on man was the true characteristic of antichrist, whether practised in England or at Rome; and it betrayed a degree of arrogance, equalled only by its injustice, when human beings coerced the religion of their fellow-creatures. Tyrannizing ecclesiastics have in every age been tenacious to aggrandize power. As arising merely out of their circumstances, without any appointment from God, they have assumed authority over their brethren, and gratified themselves with pretended superiority, but have too often failed to cherish the mind of Christ. They have not hesitated to persecute those over whom they had power; yet their efforts have always proved unavailing. The exercise of human power, how far soever it may be extended, cannot possibly force men to believe what appears to them contrary to truth, and opposed to the convictions of their minds. That religion which men adopt from ignorance, or against their conviction, is unprofitable and delusive, and consists only of civil or political subjection. To enforce true religion by compulsory agency is absolutely impossible, because every man who serves God acceptably, must serve him from choice, and in obedience to his holy word.

Archbishop Whitgift is highly commended for wisdom and gentleness, and right godly episcopal endowments!* But we learn from the testimony of his partial biographer that he was extravagantly fond of outward splendour and a magnificent retinue, the usual accompaniments of personal exaltation. His train of attendants sometimes consisted of a thousand horsemen! He adds

* Strype's Parker, Pref.

that the archbishop, being once at Dover, was attended by five hundred horsemen, one hundred of whom were his own servants, many of them wearing chains of gold, when a person of distinction, just arrived from Rome, greatly wondered to see an English archbishop with so splendid a retinue. But seeing him the following Sabbath in the cathedral of Canterbury, attended by this magnificent train, with the dean, prebendaries, and preachers, in their surplices and scarlet hoods, and hearing the music of organs, cornets, and sacbuts, he was seized with admiration, and said, "That the people at Rome were led in blindness, being made to believe that, in England, there was neither archbishop, nor bishop, nor cathedral, nor any ecclesiastical government; but that all were pulled down: yet he protested that, unless it were in the pope's chapel, he never saw a more lovely sight, or heard a more heavenly sound!"*

Mr. Cartwright and his colleagues rejected the degrading recantation as an odious infringement on the gospel, as well as on the claims of conscience. They could not purchase their freedom, and sell their consciences, on such debasing conditions. Having cherished an unflinching adherence to their principles, as the undoubted truth of God, they presented another supplication to the lord treasurer that they might be released on bail, without slavish subjection to the power of man. In this supplication, dated March 1, 1592, having lamented their multiplied hardships, they once more earnestly implored his lordship's generous aid to obtain their deliverance. They gratefully acknowledged his lordship's favourable inclination to promote their freedom from this long and tedious confinement; and they were bold, during his lordship's sickness, for which they had great cause of sorrow, to send by their wives their petition to his grace of Canterbury, a copy of which they had enclosed. They were by him directed to the attorney general, from whom they would receive the cautions and conditions of their deliverance, which it pleased his grace to call a submission. This message, which was to them exceedingly grievous, seemed to impose upon them a confession of their guilt in those things with which they were charged; which, hitherto, was not known to themselves, nor could they learn it from those whom they had earnestly desired to inform them. To

* Paule's Whitgift, p. 104—106.

obtain this information, they had sent their wives to Mr. Attorney; but he was out of town, and could not be seen.

They again came with their humble suit unto his lordship that it would please him, in closing these extreme hardships, to stand their good lord, that they might have bail, without placing them under the debasing conditions which his grace so peremptorily required. If their liberty should be tied to such conditions as they could not accept, without declaring that which was not true, and would burden their consciences before God, his lordship would easily perceive, as in refusing the oath *ex officio,* for which they had endured so long and painful an imprisonment, that they would be as far as ever from the peace they sought to obtain, to the hope of which they had lately attained by his lordship's honourable means, and most comfortable words given to their wives; that their bonds would become more heavy and hard than they were before. It was from conscience toward God which made them desire to be guiltless rather than to enjoy liberty; and it was also necessary to know they were guilty of some offence, before they could make confession to obtain deliverance from prison.

If they had transgressed the laws of the land, of which their consciences, set in the presence of God, did not accuse them, yet, seeing it plainly appeared from their answers on oath, and from the depositions of witnesses, both on their behalf and on behalf of her Majesty, that they had special care in their meetings to keep themselves in obedience to the laws, their supposed offence being in ignorance, might, in honourable equity, find the easier pardon. If their offence had been more grievous, they submitted to his lordship's honourable consideration whether so long and distressing imprisonment, being placed in the balance, was not sufficient punishment.

The prisoners, moreover, reminded his lordship that, since they had been cast into prison, divers papists, known enemies to the church and commonwealth, had been delivered from prison, without any revocation of their errors; and this was granted to all papists and schismatics promising to come to church. Their hope, therefore, was that they who not only came to church, but also laboured to the uttermost to retain others in her fellowship, and to reclaim those who had wandered from it, ought not to be more hardly treated than they, by enforcing submission contrary to the testimony

of their consciences. This, to his lordship, was as the proverb, "The north wind driveth away rain;" which was able to speak more for them than they could for themselves. That which had transpired made them the bolder to importune his lordship. They also observed that it had pleased the Almighty to visit many of them, by their long imprisonment and lack of convenient air, with sore and dangerous sickness; neither could the rest expect any better result, unless, by speedy deliverance, they obtained the remedy which that time of the year afforded. They concluded their importunity by expressing their grateful remembrance of his lordship's honourable favour towards them, and affectionately recommending him, with all his weighty affairs, to the gracious direction and blessing of God.*

The prisoners had been no more successful in approaching the archbishop than in their application to other great personages. When they pleaded for some degree of sympathy, because they were brethren, the haughty and stern prelate replied, "What signifies their being brethren? Anabaptists, Arians, and heretics would be accounted brethren. Their haughty spirits will not suffer them to see their error. They deserve as great punishment as papists, because they conspire against the church! If they be shut up in Newgate, it is a meet reward for their disorderly doings; for ignorance may not excuse libels against a private man, much less when they slander the whole church!"†

These painful sufferers, in extreme perplexity, had laid their distress before the council, and humbly supplicated their lordships' favourable consideration of their lamentable case, from whom they received the promise of release on bail; but, to their extreme mortification, this overture was suspended on the same degrading conditions as those already mentioned. Their application was, therefore, followed with no beneficial results. The reader here beholds the pitiable state of these persecuted ministers, to whom posterity still owes a debt of gratitude for having laid the foundation of that religious freedom which we now enjoy, and whose merits, though attended with imperfection, will be more liberally acknowledged as the principles of rational liberty are diffused among the people.

It is extremely doubtful whether the prisoners obtained any re-

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxix. art. 45. † Biog. Brit. vol. iii. p. 283.

laxations of their sufferings. They had certainly obtained the promise of it; but it was suspended on those degrading conditions at which their souls revolted; and, notwithstanding the promises held out, it is very probable that they endured the rigours of close confinement till their final release. These were not the only hardships they endured. Their principles and conduct were severely censured, and their characters grievously aspersed, being charged with many foul offences, more deserving of the gallows than confinement in prison. They were accused not only of perverting excommunication, of exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and of other singularities, but also of schism, rebellion, and denying her Majesty's supremacy! Their persecutors were not content with depriving them of their benefices and usefulness, and detaining them in loathsome jails from one year to another, but, to defend their unhallowed deeds, and keep alive her Majesty's indignation against them, they infused these untrue imputations in the ears of the queen, from which they expected a double reward, by saving their own credit and inflicting disgrace on their victims. Mr. Cartwright and his companions, placed in these painful circumstances, could not forget themselves, but resolved, at length, to lay their affecting case before her Majesty; for which purpose they prepared and presented to Elizabeth a circumstantial detail of facts, in vindication of their innocence and in refutation of the aspersions cast upon them, addressing her Majesty as follows:—

"May it please your excellent Majesty.

"There is nothing, right gracious Sovereign, next to the saving mercy of Almighty God, that can be more comfortable than your Highness' favour, as to all other your faithful and dutiful subjects, so to us, your Majesty's most humble suppliants, who are, by our calling, ministers of God's holy word, and by our present condition now, and of a long time, prisoners in divers prisons in and about the city of London. For which cause our most humble suit is that it may please your most excellent Majesty graciously to understand our necessary answer to such grievous charges as we hear to be informed against us, which, if they were true, might be just cause of withdrawing for ever from us your Highness' gracious protection and favour, which, above all other earthly things, we most desire to enjoy. The reason of our trouble is a suspicion

that we are guilty of many heinous crimes; but these supposed crimes we have not been charged with in any due and ordinary course of proceeding by open accusation and witnesses. But being called up to London by authority of some of your Majesty's commissioners in causes ecclesiastical, we have been required by them to take an oath of inquisition, or *office*, as it is called. For not taking of which, we were first committed to prison, and have since continued there a long time, notwithstanding that all of us, save one, have been deprived of our livings, and degraded from our ministry. As the oath is the next and immediate cause of our trouble, we have made our answer, first to that, and then to the other crimes that are suggested and secretly informed against us.

"The reason why we took not the oath is because it is without limitation of any certain matter, indefinite and general to answer whatsoever shall be demanded of us. Of this kind of oath we find neither rule nor example in the word of God; but contrariwise, both precepts and precedents of all lawful oaths reported in the same, lead to this, that an oath ought to be taken with judgment, and so as he that sweareth may see the bounds of his oath, and to what certain condition it doth bind him. This oath is to inquire of our private speeches and conferences with our dearest and nearest friends; yea, of the very secret thoughts and intents of our hearts, that so we may furnish both matter of accusation and evidence against ourselves, which did not use to be done in causes of heresy nor of high treason. These are the words of the statute of your most noble father King Henry VIII.: 'That the most expert and best learned cannot escape the danger of such captious interrogatories, as the law calleth them, which are accustomed to be administered by the ordinaries of this realm, 25 Hen. VIII. As also that it standeth not with the right order of justice, or good equity, that any person should be convicted, or put to the loss of life, good name, or goods, unless it be by due accusation and witness, or by presentment, verdict, confession, or process of outlawry.' And further, 'for the avoiding of untrue accusation and presentments, which might be maliciously conspired and kept secret and unrevealed until time might be found to have men by malice convicted thereof,' it was ordained, 35 Hen. VIII., that none should be put to answer but upon accusations and present-

ments taken in open and manifest courts by the oath of twelve men.

"As to the charge of *schism*, that we so far condemned the present state of the church that we hold it not for any true, visible church of God, as it is established by public authority within the land, and therefore refuse to have any part or communion with it in public prayers, or in the ministry of the word and sacraments; which, if it were true, we were of all men living the most unthankful, first to Almighty God, and next to your excellent Majesty, by whose blessed means we are partakers of that happy liberty of the profession of the gospel, and of the true service of God, that by your Highness' gracious government we do enjoy. We acknowledge unfeignedly, as in the sight of God, that this our church, as it is by your Highness' laws and authority established among us, having that faith professed and taught publicly in it which was agreed upon in the convocation holden in the year 1562; and such form of public prayers and administration of the sacraments as in the first year of your most gracious reign was established, (notwithstanding any thing that may need to be revised and further reformed,) to be a true, visible church of Christ, from the holy communion of which, by way of schism, it is not lawful to depart. Our whole life may show the evident proof hereof. For always before the time of our trouble, we have lived in the daily communion of it, not only as private men, but, at the time of our restraint, and many years before, preached and exercised our ministry in the same, and at this present time most earnestly beseech all in authority who are set over us, especially your excellent Majesty, that we may so proceed to serve God and your Highness all the days of our lives.

"Another crime suggested against us is that we practise *rebellion*, or purpose rebelliously to procure such further reformation of our church as we desire, by violent and undutiful means. Whereunto our answer is that as we think it not lawful to make a schism in the church for any thing that we esteem needful to be reformed in it, so do we, in all simplicity and sincerity of heart, in the presence of Almighty God, to whom all secrets are known, and of your excellent Majesty, to whom God has given the sword for just vengeance and punishment of transgressors, that

for procuring reformation of any thing that we desire to be redressed in the state of our church, we judge it most unlawful, and damnable by the word of God, to rebel, and, by force of arms, or any violent means, to seek redress thereof. And, moreover, that we never intended to use or procure any other means for the furtherance of such reformation, than only prayer to Almighty God, and most humble suit to your excellent Majesty, and others in authority, with such like dutiful and peaceable means as might give information of this our suit, and of the reasons moving us thereunto.

"The third crime misinformed against us is that we impeach your Majesty's *supremacy*. For answer whereunto, we unfeignedly protest, God being witness, that we speak the truth herein from our hearts, that we acknowledge your Highness' sovereignty and supreme power, next and immediately under God, over all persons, and in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil, in as large and ample manner as it is recognized by the high court of parliament in the statute of recognition, and is set down in the oath of supremacy enacted by the same; and as it is further declared in your Majesty's injunctions, and also in the articles of religion agreed in the convocation, and in sundry books of learned men of our nation, published and allowed by public authority. We also add, that we acknowledge the same as fully as ever it was in old time acknowledged by the prophets to belong to the virtuous kings of Judah; and as all the reformed churches in Christendom acknowledge the same to their sovereign princes, in their confessions of faith exhibited unto them, as they are set down in a book called 'The Harmony of Confessions,' and the observations annexed thereunto. And besides this protestation, we appeal to the whole course of our lives, wherein it cannot be showed that we ever made a question of it; and more particularly by our public doctrine, declaring the same, and by our taking the oath of supremacy as occasion hath required.

"It hath been odiously devised against us, concerning persons subject to excommunication, and the power thereof, how far it extendeth. Touching the former, we judge not otherwise than all the reformed churches, which are this day in the Christian world, nor than our own English church hath always heretofore

judged, and doth still at this present time, as may appear by the articles of religion agreed by the convocation, and by a book of Homilies allowed by the same; and also by sundry other books of greatest credit and authority in our church: which is, that the word of God, the sacraments, and the power of binding and loosing, are all the ordinances of Almighty God, graciously ordained for the comfort and salvation of the whole church; and that, therefore, no part or member of it is to be denied the comfortable, wholesome aid and benefit thereof, for the furtherance of their faith, and, as need may require, of their repentance. For the other part, how far this censure extendeth, we profess that it deprives a man only of *spiritual* comforts; as of being partaker of the Lord's Supper, and being present at the public prayers of the church, or such like, without taking away either liberty, goods, lands, government, private or public whatsoever, or any other civil or earthly commodity of this life. Wherefore, from our hearts, we detest and abhor that intolerable presumption of the Bishop of Rome, taking upon him, in such cases, to depose sovereign princes from their highest seats of supreme government, and discharging their subjects from that dutiful obedience which, by the laws of God, they ought to perform.

"Concerning our *conferences*, we have been charged to have given orders, and made ministers, and to have administered the censures of the church, and, finally, to have exercised all ecclesiastical jurisdiction. To which suggestion we answer that, indeed, of long time we have used, as other ministers have done, as we think, in most parts of the land, to meet sometimes, and to confer together; which, being granted to all good and dutiful subjects upon occasion to resort and meet together, we esteem it lawful for us so to do. For, besides the common affairs of all men, which may give them just cause to meet with their acquaintance and friends, mutually to communicate one with another, for their comfort and help, men professing learning have more necessary and special use of such conferences for their furtherance in such knowledge as they profess. But such as are professed ministers of the word have sundry great and necessary causes so to do more than others, because of the manifold knowledge, both of divinity and also of divers tongues and sciences, that are of great use for the

better qualifying them for their ministry; in which respect the conferences of the ministers were allowed by many bishops within their dioceses, and, to our knowledge, were never disallowed or forbidden by any. Some late years also have given us more special cause of conferring together; while Jesuits' seminaries, and other heretics, sought to seduce many. Also some schismatics condemned the whole state of our church, as no part of the true visible church of Christ, and therefore refused to have any part or communion with it; upon which occasion it was needful for us to advise of the best way and means we could to keep the people that we had the charge to instruct from such damnable errors. Because some reckoned us to have part with that schism, and reported us to agree in nothing, but to differ one from another in the reformation we desire, we have special cause to confer together, that we might set down some things touching such matters, which at all times, whensoever we should be demanded, might be our true and just defence, both to clear us from partaking with the schism and to witness for us that we agreed in the reformation which we desired. But as touching the thing surmised of our meetings, that we exercise in them all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, in making ministers, in censuring and excommunicating, and in ordaining constitutions and orders upon each censures to bind any, we protest before God and the holy angels that we never exercised any part of such jurisdiction, nor had any purpose agreed among us to exercise the same, before we should be authorized thereunto by public law. Further also, touching these our meetings, we affirm they were only of ministers, saving in some parts where schoolmasters, desirous to train themselves to the ministry, joined us; and of the said ministers only six or seven, or the like small number in a conference, without deed or appearance that might be offensive to any.

"As to *singularity*, though it be not subject to any punishment of law, it is suggested against us, by such as favour not our most humble desire of a further reformation, to disgrace us, and to make us odious to others, and chiefly to your excellent Majesty. Wherein our answer is that the discipline of the primitive church is ancient, and so acknowledged by the Book of Common-prayer, in these words: 'There was a godly discipline in the primitive

church; instead whereof, until the said discipline be restored again, which thing is much to be wished, it is thought convenient to use such form of commination as is prescribed.' Further also, if it please your Majesty with favour to understand it from us, we are ready to show that, in those points of the ecclesiastical discipline of our church which we desire most humbly may be reformed, we hold no singular or private opinion, but the truth of the word of God, acknowledged to be such by all the best churches and writers of ancient times, and of this present age.

"Thus have we declared, right gracious Sovereign, truly and sincerely, as we will answer it to God and to your Majesty, upon our allegiance, what judgment we are of concerning the matters informed against us. And we further testify that no minister within this land desiring a further reformation, with whom we have had any private acquaintance or conference of these matters, whosoever may be otherwise informed, is of any other mind or opinion in these cases that have been named. By which declaration, if, according to our earnest prayer to Almighty God, your Majesty shall clearly discern us to stand free from all such matters as we are charged with, our most humble suit is that your Majesty's gracious favour, which is more dear and precious to us than our lives, may be extended to us, and that, by means thereof, we may enjoy the comfortable liberty of our persons and ministry as we did before our troubles: which, if by your Highness' special favour and goodness we may obtain, we promise and vow to Almighty God, and your excellent Majesty, to behave ourselves in so peaceable and dutiful a sort in every respect as may give no just cause of your Highness' offence; but according to our callings, both in doctrine and example, as heretofore, so always hereafter, to teach due obedience to your Majesty among other parts of holy doctrine, and to pray for your Majesty's long and blessed reign over us in this life, and the enjoyment of life everlasting in the kingdom of heaven with Almighty God and all his holy angels."*

This supplicatory defence commends itself to every man's conscience; yet it does not appear whether any favourable impression was made on the mind of Queen Elizabeth. The prisoners did not obtain the least immediate alleviation of their sufferings; but

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxxii. art. 49.

it would seem that they continued to endure the undiminished rigours of confinement. Sir George Paule, too fond of extolling the better qualities of his hero, affirms that Archbishop Whitgift, at length, procured from the queen the pardon and release of Mr. Cartwright and his companions.* Their release is also represented as effected by the *favour* of the archbishop, who, reflecting on Mr. Cartwright's abilities and their ancient acquaintance in Trinity college, and remembering that they had brandished their pens against each other, and that they were both well stricken in years, and fearing the success of so tough a conflict, on Mr. Cartwright's general promise of quiet and peaceable behaviour, it is added that the archbishop procured the dismission of his cause, and obtained his release from prison.† Whether this deliverance was a "favour," or an act of justice, the reader will be able to judge; and how far it was procured by the efforts of Whitgift will best appear from other testimony. One author ascribes Mr. Cartwright's release to the lords of the council as a body, and that it was their *honours'* pleasure "to deliver him from confinement;" and the other declares that Whitgift "only gave his *consent* to Mr. Cartwright's discharge," which was undoubtedly become a matter of expediency, for which no great degree of praise was due to him.‡ It is certain, however, that the Lord Treasurer Burghley procured for the prisoners their final release from prison; and for this act of justice, which could not be forgotten, Mr. Cartwright cherished deep sensibility, and presented to his lordship his warmest thanks, as expressed in the following letter:—

"Right honourable,—The Persians, according to Zenophon, punished an unthankful man as a criminal, which sin, if it were so among heathens, it ought to be of much more evil report among Christians, taught in a far better school of thankfulness than they are. But among all others, it would be of the foulest and blackest note in the ministers of the word, who, touching thankfulness to others, and to God, in being unmindful, receive against themselves a deep condemnation. Wherefore, having felt of your benevolent and honourable favour before in prison, and now much more in some liberty which I now enjoy, I thought it my part as soon as I

* Paule's Whitgift, p. 70. † Fuller, b. ix. p. 204.

‡ Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 45; Strype's Whitgift, p. 370.

got out of the physician's hands, as out of a second prison, to testify to your lordship my dutiful remembrance of so great a benefit, whereof your lordship hath been so singular a means. Which thing having only touched, lest, in desiring and endeavouring some duty, I should be found troublesome to your lordship, and injurious to others, who, by your honourable travails, enjoy peace. That which remains I will supply with my daily prayers to Almighty God, that, together with long life, he would daily bless your lordship with increase of all other his heavenly blessings, which, in his infinite wisdom, he knoweth best to agree with your honourable calling. From Hackney, the 21st of May, 1592. Your lordship's most humbly to command."*

Mr. Cartwright's companions in tribulation were probably released at the same time; but, being deprived of their benefices, and also under the frowns of ecclesiastical power, while they and their families were left in a state of pining destitution, their prospects could not be otherwise than most gloomy. We have traced the history of this great struggle to its termination, and have furnished the reader with a full view of the proceedings as derived from unexceptionable records. The prisoners, it will be seen, lived in "troublous times," suffering for the sake of Christ and a good conscience. The detail exhibits that severe trial of principle and that unbending exercise of conscience which is rarely found in the history of man; and it may be hoped that this part of the narrative will afford salutary instruction, if not seasonable admonition, to various ranks of society. An apologist of the proceedings of Elizabeth's reign, who usually paints in deep colours the principles and intentions of the puritans, has nevertheless, with honour and justice, exposed the treatment of Mr. Cartwright and his brethren. The long imprisonment of these men, says he, engendered arguments concerning its legality; and it was maintained that no judge had authority to tender the oath *ex officio* in cases prejudicial to the parties: Mr. Cartwright and his friends were, therefore, unjustly detained for declining it. They merely refused to make their defence until the accuser came forward with his witnesses. Not only equity and reason could be pleaded in this case, but also the common law, the law of God, and even the canon law;

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxxii. art. 51.

none of which required men to stand forth sworn witnesses against themselves! Such views were branded with ignorance, as well as injustice; so that reasonings and information in favour of the prisoners soon obtained extensive circulation. The powers of ecclesiastical courts, not excepting the court of High-commission, were daily called in question. An imputation of illegality was fixed, not only upon their imprisonment for refusing the oath *ex officio*, but also upon the deprivation of puritanical incumbents, whose benefices were considered their freeholds, and, consequently, cognisable only by regular indictment in a court of common law. In addition to all this, many who had no affection for puritanism, and were far from cherishing the proposed discipline, disapproved of illegal measures to keep it out of the church.*

Men may attempt to extenuate these unrighteous deeds; but the facts are inscribed on unimpeachable records, the enormities are undiminished by the lapse of time, the deep stain on the persecutors will remain to the latest posterity. If the dominant ecclesiastics, instead of being influenced by evil custom, or biassed by intolerance, had inquired how they ought to have treated these innocent Christian men, the answer was ready, and the task easy: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

The prisoners were men of superior piety, and their faith and patience will shine with imperishable honour on the monument which records their names. With becoming submission to the administration of Jesus Christ, they endured as seeing him who is invisible; and, for whose sake, they were willing to suffer the loss of all things, that they might finish their course with joy. They shrank not in the hour of danger; but, exercising constancy of principle and honesty of purpose, they bore a succession of trials with honour, magnanimity, and triumph. They engaged in a great moral conflict; and the conquest they achieved far surpassed, in dignity and importance, the most splendid victories of earthly warriors, the fame of whose exploits resounded through the world. The deeds and sufferings of Mr. Cartwright and his brethren, which

* Soames' Elizabeth, p. 402—404.

are held in remembrance before God, cannot be forgotten among men. The weight of secular and ecclesiastical power, the bigotry and intolerance of the times, the profane wit and false accusation of needy foes, were all combined to entangle and oppress them; but they refused to degrade their principles by succumbing to that domination which subverted the rights of conscience and opposed the commands of God.

Mr. Cartwright, if guilty of any offence, sought to be convicted on evidence; but to be punished by continued severe imprisonment, without witness, jury, or verdict, he considered as opposed alike to justice and Christianity. Such worldly elements might advance the religion of the *state*, but he believed they were foreign to the religion of Jesus Christ. The spiritual jurisdiction appointed in the New Testament was absorbed and lost in temporal jurisdiction and unrighteous commitments, which measures, so far from advancing the kingdom of Christ, created a formidable barrier against the progress of the gospel and the spiritual and eternal welfare of men! Mr. Cartwright felt, to his cost, that this was very different agency from that appointed by Jesus Christ. The painful struggle clearly shows how dangerous is the principle of men assuming power over conscience, especially as this assumption occasioned nearly all the persecutions crowded on the page of history; its horrors through many centuries are written in characters of blood!

We might leave the facts here detailed to tell their own story; yet it may not be improper to make some further comment on these extraordinary proceedings. To regulate man's intercourse with God was not only impossible, but also to attempt it was an attempt to usurp the power of Deity. "The church of Christ," said Bishop Hooper, "the more it is burdened with men's laws, the farther it is from the true and sincere verity of God's word. The church must, therefore, be bound to no other authority than unto the voice of the gospel and the authority thereof. It is a false and usurped authority that men attribute unto the clergy, and bind the word of God and Christ's church to the succession of bishops and others. My opinion to all the world is that the Scripture and the apostles' churches are solely to be followed, and no man's authority, or even cherubim or seraphim. I speak not of

the laws of magistrates and princes, who daily ordain new laws for the preservation of their commonwealth, as they may see the necessities of the realm require; but the church of Christ must be for ever governed by the word of God. 'We ought to obey God rather than men.'"*

It will not be doubted that Mr. Cartwright made a bold stand against the encroachment of ecclesiastical power, and that, by his writings and sufferings, he brought to light many hidden and important truths, and laid a foundation of a new reformation, when rational man, possessing understanding and conscience, shall be raised to the dignity of man, and when coercive edicts in religion shall exist only on the page of history. The soul will then be released from its prison-house, its energies receive a powerful impulse in pursuit of truth, and the church of Christ obtain a glorious triumph!

The reader will conclude, from the foregoing statements, that the Anglican church had departed very far from the holy administration appointed by Jesus Christ, and that it had to undergo an important change before it could be conformable to apostolic institutions. When this interesting change shall be effected, the church will be rescued from multiplied deviations from the gospel, and be restored to the characteristic position which the churches occupied when they came forth from God; then will its best energies be no longer crippled and thwarted, but its honour and usefulness greatly augmented and perpetuated. The celebrated Wycliffe, addressing those in power, said, "If they would have their dominion kept entire, and not fiendishly torn piecemeal, and the peace of the church restored, let them have a proper zeal for the *ordinance of Christ*, to the end that they may reform the church. Then," he adds, "would be done away the simoniacal entanglement of the clergy; and, what is best of all, as Christ's word would run to and fro freely everywhere, so many more would wing their way to heaven."†

The reader will naturally inquire, For what purpose were the foregoing severities inflicted? Queen Elizabeth's avowed object and determinate aim was to establish uniformity of faith and worship; but we are reminded, by a zealous churchman, that every year the object was rendered more hopeless, and that the unwise attempt

* Hooper's Declaration, p. 26—31. † Wycliffe's Tracts, p. 175.

betrayed severe oppression!* It was equally impracticable as to create a world. The Established Church has made trial nearly three hundred years, but still remains equally remote from uniformity as at any former period, struggling under lamentable animosity and distraction in every corner of the empire.† The close assimilation between the English and the Romish hierarchy has doubtless contributed to the present system of semi-popery. Those who depreciate Divine truth find no difficulty in sliding half-way, or altogether, from the errors of the one into those of the other. While fanaticism stalks through the land, and men promulgate "another gospel, perverting the gospel of Christ," ought not all right-minded churchmen to employ every legitimate effort to stay the plague and remove its contagion?

It ought to be borne in mind that the uniformity so much admired constituted no part of the Saviour's commission given to his apostles; but they were instructed to preach the gospel and plant churches without asking permission from man. Their administration rested on Divine authority. They, acting in obedience to the Saviour's direct warrant, entered the dominions of earthly princes, and planted churches, unauthorized by worldly power. This system of mercy is unchangeable. No body of men on earth are authorized, or even qualified, to make laws appropriate to the churches of Christ; but every attempt to do this seems an impeachment of the Saviour's administration, an infringement of His sovereignty, an usurpation of His prerogative. In planting the apostolic churches,

* Soames' Elizabeth, p. 3.

† If this statement require amplification or proof, it will be found in a "Letter" published by the Archbishop of Canterbury, dated Lambeth Palace, January 11, 1845, and addressed "to the clergy and laity of his province." The venerable primate commences his cautious epistle by expressing his anxiety about "divisions in the church, and the diversities of practice in the performance of divine service." His grace then complains of "ambiguity of the rubrics," of "animosities," of "divisions," of "deviation from the rubric," of "diversity of practice in the generality of parochial churches," of "irregularity become inveterate," of "unauthorised innovations," and of "the observance of laws, which have been long suffered to sleep, have now the appearance of novelty!" What language could more effectually portray the great want of conformity? But when will intelligent men be able to learn that uniformity in religion, often extolled to the skies, is absolutely impossible? The object of all this strife is to bury spiritual religion in formulary observances, to shroud inspired truth in the obscurities of tradition, to conduct a crusade in favour of Romanizing pre-eminence, and to replace the episcopal church in the fond embraces of Rome!

their only Lord and King was too wise to leave their legislation and government to be regulated by the discretion of mortals; and it is an unbounded mercy that churches are not allowed to make laws for themselves, nor others for them; but that, in all spiritual concerns, they are to be ruled by enactments "holy, just, and good," being all-sufficient and unalterable. The nature as well as the origin of Christian churches demonstrates that Jesus Christ is their only Lawgiver and Judge. Men in power would, therefore, have acted wisely had they always confined their attention to objects within their legitimate province, and refused to legislate for the churches of Christ, recollecting that the Lord Jesus is the avenger of all who presume to interpose between Him and His institutions! *

The reader has witnessed the long and memorable struggle between the ruling prelates, especially Archbishop Whitgift, and the suffering servants of God. From the detail here furnished, he will be able to form a true estimate of this unexampled dispute. Though he may find some difficulty in applauding the "meekness and forbearance" of the right reverend prelates, so frequently eulo-

* The learned Hooker, in attempting to prove that princes possess ecclesiastical power, and may exercise that power in the legislation and government of religion, derives the main strength of his argument from the character of the Jewish dispensation. He does not seem to have been conscious that the force of his argument was easy of detection, amounting simply to this: Because, under that economy, *God* appointed princes to legislate in religion, therefore, under Christianity, *men* may do the same! But who does not behold the fallacy of this? If Jesus Christ be the only head of the church—if his churches be responsible to Him *alone* for their religion—if the revelation he has given be their only and all-sufficient authority—and if the rulers of the earth are neither commanded to make ecclesiastical laws nor expressly forbidden, as Mr. Hooker unhesitatingly affirms, how is it possible to be their duty to make laws for Christian churches? If the Lord Jesus, or even his churches, had been in the least need of assistance from earthly rulers, would not He assuredly have required it in his holy word? But if he has not required it, and Mr. Hooker says he has not, they have no duty to perform; but to perform services not required, and when no duty exists, would be works of supererogation! The learned author is, nevertheless, worthy of commendation for having fully exempted *consciences* and *souls* from the iron grasp of human power. "The conscience," says he, "is the proper court of God, the guiltiness whereof is sin, and the punishment eternal death. Men are not able to make any law that shall command the heart; it is not in them to make inward conceit a crime, or to appoint for any crime other punishment than corporal: their laws, therefore, can have no power over the soul, neither can the heart of man be polluted by transgressing them!" This author seems to have been unconscious that it was impossible to enforce religion by penal sanctions without aggression on conscience and souls, and that his admission here stated was absolutely fatal to the system which he endeavours to establish.—*Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*, vol. iii. p. 274—329.

gized in modern times, yet he can scarcely help admiring the courage and patience, the meekness and constancy of these sufferers for Christ. It pleased God so to overrule these persecutions, that the very persons brought to accuse Mr. Cartwright and his companions so fully acquitted them that they returned home with increased honour, and were much more beloved than they were before these heavy trials.*

But the reader may feel some surprise when reminded that the conduct of the bishops is highly applauded for their "great benignity and clemency" to the prisoners! and that "the imprisonment of Mr. Cartwright was not so grevious nor so costly to him that either he or others should complain or lament the remembrance of it! So soft was his lying, so trim was his lodging, so pleasant was his company, so dainty was his fare, so great were his gifts, so diligent was his wife to rake in rewards, that many men of good desert, who served her Majesty in her wars, would have been content, the shame only excepted, to have exchanged the commodity of their places with him."† This is an extraordinary statement, and undoubtedly the first instance we ever met with of a long and close imprisonment being so peculiarly desirable! This shows to what miserable shifts men are driven when attempting to defend a bad cause. Though it is explicitly stated that Archbishop Whitgift granted Mr. Cartwright a license to preach, which would seem to indicate an entire release, yet the author now cited observes, not only that *great favour* was conferred upon him by his release from prison, but also that he was still under bond, on receiving suitable notice, to appear before the High-commission. Though dismissed from his dreary abode in the Fleet, yet, according to this writer, he was not fully discharged.‡ Mr. Cartwright made a stand for the liberty of the subject and the rightful inheritance of man, which will endear his name to all generous minds, and be a sure defence against the disgraceful attacks on his character, so common from those who dread the power of his principles.

It would be improper to dismiss this part of the narrative without further amplification of these important occurrences. Having taken a comprehensive survey of this great struggle, and having

* Clark, p. 18. † Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 45.

‡ Walton's Hooker, p. 85, 86; Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 44.

entered into a patient investigation of the principles of the sufferers, as derived from unexceptionable records, the inquisitive reader will naturally ask whence all this misery originated? Queen Elizabeth claimed from the two houses of parliament the same power and authority, in all ecclesiastical causes, and over all ecclesiastical persons, as that which the pope had usurped; all of which the right reverend prelates, especially Archbishop Whitgift, duly and faithfully ascribed to her Majesty!* The archbishop was a well-tutored courtier. His views admirably coincided with those of Elizabeth; and her Majesty held his principles and proceedings, especially those which advanced her prerogative, in the highest veneration. This her Majesty testified by investing him with the management of all her ecclesiastical affairs. The queen often said "that she pitied him, because she trusted him, and had eased herself by laying the burden of all her clergy-affairs upon his shoulders," which he is said "to have managed with prudence and piety!" We are also reminded that her Majesty would never eat flesh in Lent, without obtaining a license from "her little black husband," as she usually styled him!†

But, it will be asked, by whom were the two houses of parliament furnished with ability to impart this extraordinary jurisdiction to a single person? To affirm that they had the power of doing whatsoever they pleased, right or wrong, possible or impossible, will leave the question unanswered. What evidence then had they of possessing sufficient authority to confer the transcendent prerogative upon her Majesty? If the two houses possessed spiritual supremacy, when was it given them? and who gave it? Where is the document of conveyance, as evidence of this solemn transaction? But if those political functionaries did not themselves possess spiritual jurisdiction, how could they implant it in the breast of the queen?

It does not require profound learning to ascertain that it was impossible for civil rulers to create and convey legitimate spiritual power; when, therefore, the two houses professedly invested her Majesty with supreme power and authority in all spiritual concerns, which they themselves did not possess, the proceeding ought to have made Britain weep tears of blood! Mr. Hooker makes

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 258, 260, Appen. p. 153. † Walton's Lives, p. 240, 242.

this declaration: "As for supreme power in ecclesiastical affairs, the word of God doth no where appoint that all kings should have it, neither that any should not have it; for which cause it seemeth to stand altogether by human right that unto Christian kings there is such dominion given!"* This is certainly a remarkable statement; though the author omitted to say *when*, and by *whom*, the extraordinary power was bestowed, and even to furnish evidence of the solemn transaction, yet he reflects additional light on the momentous subject. He explicitly declares that spiritual power can neither be claimed as a natural right nor even be instituted by human authority, because it relates to subjects "supernatural and divine."† "Nor is it possible that any form of policy, much less of polity ecclesiastical, should be good, unless God himself be the author of it. 'Those things that are not of God,' says Tertullian, 'they can have no other than God's adversary for their author!' Be it whatsoever in the church of God, if it be not of God, we hate it!"‡ Will it then be said that the spiritual power, supposed to have been conferred upon Queen Elizabeth, came from God, when the obvious fact is that it came merely from certain political functionaries at Westminster? Are we then forced to the conclusion that the whole affair was a political juggle? The two houses adopted this extraordinary measure by all the formality of a public act; but, until they could invest her Majesty with power which they did not possess, and which she could not exercise, the whole proceeding was a direct assumption. Might they not with equal truth and propriety have enacted that the royal princess was the Creator of the world or the Governor of the universe? And was it not impossible for any creature in heaven or on earth to invest, or to be invested, with spiritual supremacy, since this is the exclusive prerogative of Jesus Christ? If, moreover, the doctrines and laws, the constitution and government of that kingdom which is not of this world, be matters of pure revelation, and are all contained in the statute-book of Christian churches, then we have here a twofold usurpation—the two houses in *conferring*, and Elizabeth in *accepting*, that jurisdiction which was the sovereign prerogative of the Son of God!

By an extraordinary act of legislation, the title of "supreme head of the church" was conferred upon Henry VIII., which till then it

* Hooker's Eccl. Polity, vol. iii. p. 267. † Ibid. p. 165. ‡ Ibid. vol. i. p. 207.

was absolutely unknown in Britain. But how was it possible to reconcile this supremacy, derived from political power, to the regal and unbounded supremacy of Jesus Christ? Had not He rightful sovereignty over his word and worship, and over every man's conscience and affections? "All power is given unto him in heaven and in earth." What creature then had the least warrant to interfere with this? The Saviour said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Are not all its peculiarities under *His* immediate and exclusive control, to whom that kingdom belongs?

But why should either Henry or Elizabeth assume such high authority in the church of God? What being in existence, except the Lord of all, could possess sufficient ability to legislate and govern in religious matters? Men in exalted stations have, in all ages, miscalculated their position; have made too lofty claims merely from their rank in society; have exercised an indefinite, but mysterious, power over the churches of Jesus Christ; and have adopted the dangerous expedient of being "lords over God's heritage!" Their semi-popery notions not only defaced Christian churches, and furnished ample stimulus to priestcraft and worldly ambition, but those notions were unsustained by Scripture, contrary to the mind of Christ, calculated to foster human pride, and could not fail to generate hostilily against the essential purity of the gospel. And, let it be remembered, that by similar assumption, carried only to a greater extent, was the Romish antichrist created and established; but the papal apostacy, instead of having been made an object of imitation, ought to have operated as a powerful warning to all classes of protestants, lest, by cherishing the same dominant principles, they should plunge into similar condemnation! Why then did professed protestants imitate the man of sin in this momentous affair? Mr. Hooker, pleading for the spiritual power of princes, unhesitatingly affirms, "This power being sometime in the Bishop of Rome, who, by sinister practices, had drawn it into his own hands, was for just considerations by public consent annexed unto the king's royal seat and crown!"* But if the nation had not been long unhappily trained in antichristian darkness and servitude, would not the people have been shocked at this unrighteous assumption? Has not Jesus Christ,

* Hooker's Eccl. Polity, vol. iii. p. 313.

as sovereign Lord of his churches, exclusive dominion over his word, his worship, his ordinances, and every man's faith and conscience? Why then do men coercively intermeddle in such matters? By demanding that obedience which is due to Christ, do they not depreciate his authority and encroach on his prerogative? If they made laws to restrict the light of the sun, or to control the wind of heaven, would they display greater inconsistency than by making laws to restrict the gospel and control the worship of God?

The reader can scarcely forget that religion was a private affair between man and his Maker; and that, in all its concerns, every man had an indisputable right, and was under immutable obligation, to follow the instructions of inspired truth. Every man possessed this right as the gift of the Creator, to whom *alone* he was responsible in such matters; but so far as earthly rulers employed force in religion, they attempted to deprive man of the Creator's gift, and to subvert man's responsibility to God. Coercion could no more affect the opinions of honest, intelligent men, than it could affect the sun in the firmament. Men who grounded their faith and practice on the testimony of Scripture, and appreciated their responsibility, could not present that homage unto mortals which the great Judge demanded. On these holy principles, the army of martyrs made a noble stand, for which they bled and died; and on these principles, Mr. Cartwright suffered long and painful incarceration. He was classed with those "who hazarded their lives for the name of Jesus Christ." Christianity, in his opinion, was not a revelation to men in high stations, with which they were intrusted for the use of others, to measure it out as they might deem expedient, and to regulate its concerns as they pleased, but it was imparted equally and unreservedly to all to whom it was sent; its instructions created in all personal responsibility to God, excluding all compulsory interference from man. If it be admitted that Mr. Cartwright had an undoubted right to use his intellect and believe the Bible, to propagate Christianity and hold intercourse with heaven, especially if God demanded all this, what bold intruder could have the least shadow of warrant to interpose and prevent him exercising this right? What man on earth, unless awfully ignorant or perfectly reckless, would stretch forth his arm to create this disruption between man and his Maker?

The foregoing struggle clearly shows that men in power diverted the attention of the people from the purity and simplicity of the gospel, by setting up human traditions and worldly ordinances as matters of religious obligation. Those who claimed the power of controlling the gospel, and the ministers of Christ, made a bold attempt to elevate the wisdom of man above the wisdom of God, substituting traditionary inventions in the place of God's commands. Instead of bowing gratefully and devoutly to His authority, the ecclesiastical rulers forcibly taught "for doctrines the commandments of men;" but this obtrusion seemed lamentably subversive of Christianity: its spirit and character, its faith and worship, its instructions and benefits, received a severe shock.

The great principle here illustrated may be imbodied in the following propositions: That a legitimate power to legislate in religion must of necessity be founded on a Divine commission. That where such commission is wanting, religious obedience cannot, in justice, be demanded. That religious obedience cannot rest on human policy, but on the exclusive authority of God. That no power on earth can lawfully make that necessary to admittance into the *church* which God has not made necessary to admittance into *heaven*. That all persons who must answer for themselves *hereafter* are under obligation to judge and choose for themselves *now*. That, in all matters of faith and worship, every man is responsible to God *alone;* when men, therefore, enforce religion by compulsory edicts, and inflict punishment for disobedience, they not only cherish the spirit of persecution, but also assume the prerogative of God. The lamentable proceedings narrated in the foregoing pages tampered with the only sound principle of faith and worship, while they disregarded the anathema denounced against all who increase or diminish the Christian code; yet, with absurdity equalled only by its injustice, Queen Elizabeth and her bishops unsheathed the sword in defence of what they called the church of our Lord Jesus Christ!

These observations will not be deemed either unimportant or inappropriate by those who found their religious obligations on the claims of Deity; while, at the same time, they afford a sufficient justification of the conduct of our puritan Reformer, and also characterize the deeds of the contrary party. Mr. Cartwright, by

this memorable struggle, nobly withstood the encroachment of arbitrary power, and continued resolute and unmoved in defence of the dearest birthright of man: the right of believing the Bible—of observing its instructions—of exercising his judgment and conscience! This was his only claim, in which he presented an example worthy of the imitation of posterity. He could not surrender this claim to gain the world; he therefore suffered the rigours of long and severe incarceration rather than be the slave of usurpation, in defiance of the word of God. He was, however, very far from assuming to have attained unto perfection, but was subject to the ordinary infirmities of his nature, which he constantly deplored before God; yet, making allowance for human frailties, every enlightened protestant will admire the soundness of his piety, the power of his principles, the fortitude of his mind, the integrity of his purpose, and the worthiness of his conduct.

CHAPTER XI.

TRIALS—DEATH—CHARACTER—WORKS—CONCLUSION.

No man can claim exemption from troubles, a considerable portion of which is sometimes allotted to persons of great eminence. In the days of our forefathers, when princes and prelates claimed the power of controlling the gospel and its ministers, a man's principles and piety, his learning and usefulness, afforded no security against detraction and accusation. In those distracted times, the best of men, though deserving of more humane treatment, frequently suffered not only severe incarceration, but also the basest reproach that human ingenuity could devise. Mr. Cartwright, who had endured no ordinary measure of trials, was not doomed to linger any more in prison, yet he found it impossible, in those evil days, to escape degrading reproach and unjust crimination.

The subject of this memoir was accused of having united with Hacket, Coppinger, and Arthington in their conspiracy against the government. For their mad outbreak, Hacket suffered death; Coppinger became distracted, and died in prison; and Arthington, having manifested repentance, was pardoned and released.* Dr. Cosin, whose authority is deemed most valid, stated the slight acquaintance between Mr. Cartwright and these conspirators, which consisted only of Coppinger's addressing a letter to him, without the least reference, directly or indirectly, to the subject.† The frantic outbreak, however, brought considerable odium upon the puritans as a body, who are charged with having refused to discover the conspiracy.‡ But no evidence has ever yet appeared that

* Biog. Brit. vol. i. p. 260—262. † Cosin's Conspiracy, p. 28.
‡ Heylin's Pres. p. 305, 306.

any one was at all acquainted with the affair, nor even that the conspirators themselves were privy to the outbreak any length of time before its explosion.

These insurrectionists had pretended to extraordinary zeal in religion, and expressed their wishes to promote a purer reformation of the church; but they had never made known their purpose of open rebellion against her Majesty's government. The puritan ministers, especially Mr. Cartwright, considered them as under a gross delusion, and as disordered in their minds, and treated them accordingly, hoping that this was the most ready method to get rid of their impertinence. No man of sense could think of troubling the magistrate by giving information of the wild and romantic discourse of such men; but that any puritan ministers were at all acquainted with their rebellious intentions is not pretended even by their enemies. And who, knowing any thing of the principles and character of the puritans, would ever imagine them likely to countenance these men, when it is recollected that Coppinger and Arthington proclaimed that Jesus Christ was actually come in Hacket?

The reproaches cast upon the puritans were made abundantly manifest when first propagated, equally to their credit and the discomfiture of their adversaries. Men seeking their own worldly interest, and dreading Mr. Cartwright's principles, were extremely industrious in the propagation of slanderous reports; and some even defiled the press with publications thickly larded with detraction and untruth. Among these was Dr. Matthew Sutcliffe, Dean of Exeter, to whom reference has been already made, but whom the celebrated Beza styled "a peevish reproacher rather than a Christian disputer."* Mr. Cartwright, under the treatment of this unworthy writer, did not render railing for railing; yet he was not unmindful of the reputation of his own character. Convinced of the propriety of silencing slanderous reports, he published a vindication of himself, exposing these unjust criminations, entitled, "A Briefe Apologie against all such Slaunderous Accusations as it pleaseth M. Sutcliffe, in his Pamphlettes most iniuriously to loade him with," quar. 1596. The author, in this work, favoured the public with a complete justification of his conduct, and exhibited

* Strype's Whitgift, p. 408.

the weakness and untruth of this accuser of the brethren. He decisively proved that he never saw Hacket or Arthington, and that he never held any intercourse with them by letter or otherwise. To a friend, who consulted him concerning Coppinger's peculiarities, he stated his reasons for proving him to be under a delusion, and recommended his friends, just before the outrage broke out, to place him under confinement in Bridewell or Bedlam; that when he proposed visiting Mr. Cartwright in prison, he refused to see him; and that when he sent Mr. Cartwright a letter, probably the one to which we have referred, he refused to receive it, or so much as look upon the superscription. He, moreover, warned his friends, from the first, to beware of Coppinger as a man in a state of mental derangement.*

This open exposure ought to have satisfied all persons of sober inquiry; and, no doubt, gave perfect satisfaction to every one of unbiassed reflection. Had there been the slightest ground for the accusation, it would certainly have been found among the articles of Mr. Cartwright's impeachment in the Star Chamber, or he would have been called before the authorities for such misdemeanor, especially as he was then confined in prison. An historian, having alluded to the calumnies of Camden, Echard, Heylin, and Nichols, makes the inquiry, "Had these ecclesiastical dignitaries no better way of defending that kingdom which is of this world against the kingdom of Jesus Christ than by propagating falsehood? I am ashamed of their folly and baseness."† Mr. Baxter noticed a writer of those times, who "breathed bloodthirsty malice" against the old puritans, and who falsely, but confidently, accused Mr. Cartwright of having been confederate with Hacket and his frantic associates; but Mr. Baxter had in his possession Mr. Cartwright's manuscript, containing a triumphant defence against the slanderous imputations which Dr. Sutcliffe and others heaped upon him.‡.

It was no easy matter, however, to stay the pen of Dean Sutcliffe, who, probably, without blushing, published his "Examination of M. Tho. Cartwright's Late Apologie," quar. 1596. But a learned and zealous churchman, a man of greater honesty and

* Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 32, 33. † Oldmixon, vol. i. p. 599.
‡ Life of Baxter, p. 113, 231.

truth than this writer, having furnished his opinion of this dispute, fully acquits Mr. Cartwright and his brethren. He openly states that this business of Hacket happened very unseasonably for the puritans, who as cordially detested his blasphemies as any of the episcopal party; and such of them as loved Hacket the *nonconformist* abhorred Hacket the *heretic*, after he had mounted to so high a pitch of impiety. He, moreover, considered the stigma cast upon the puritans as a base aspersion, without the shadow of truth; and therefore adds that they were unable to wash this odium from themselves as fast as their adversaries cast it upon them. This rendered them so hated at court that, for some time, no favourite dare present a petition in their behalf to the queen, lest he should lose himself to save others, so offended was her Majesty against them!*

Mr. Cartwright, not knowing what a day might bring forth, had other trials awaiting him. His release from prison was under an engagement to maintain a quiet and peaceable behaviour, when he had never behaved otherwise; and, having been restored to his hospital at Warwick, he had given entire satisfaction by a scrupulous regard to his promise. We are gravely informed, however, that Archbishop Whitgift bestowed upon him "many personal favours;" and, if he did, it certainly was not more than duty required, as some compensation for the injury he had inflicted upon him. If his grace testified this act of justice, it was not intended as a compensation for his losses and sufferings, but as a matter of courtesy. Mr. Cartwright having retired to his charge, the archbishop granted him a license to preach, on his promise not to meddle with controversy, but incline his hearers to piety and moderation; and this promise he kept to the day of his death.†

He retired to his hospital, and occasioned no further uneasiness. He had come to an age when this world was gliding into another. His future days were spent in acquiring and strengthening those habits which alone were fitted for eternity. His old antagonist was also hastening to his long home, who, having concurred in his release, lived on terms of friendship with him. Another writer, applauding the lenity and kindness of the archbishop, relates that Mr. Cartwright, after his release from prison, often repaired to his

* Fuller, b. ix. p. 206. † Walton's Hooker, p. 85, 86.

grace, who treated him kindly, and, for several years, *tolerated* his preaching at Warwick! Will it not be asked, What can exhibit more grievous assumption than one man claiming the power of tolerating another to preach the gospel, since Jesus Christ gave his command, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature?"

It is admitted that, in later times, men in power tolerate the religion of their fellow-men—tolerate them to believe the gospel—tolerate them to obey the instructions of the Bible—tolerate them to worship God! What is this but tolerating God to receive their service? May they not, with no clearer absurdity, tolerate the sun to shine or the world to exist? The fact, however, can neither be concealed nor too well understood that the elements composing Christian churches, and those composing civil communities, can never be amalgamated without invading the Saviour's authority, degrading His institutions, subverting His administration, and endangering men's eternal interests! Whitgift's toleration was an ecclesiastical permit, by which he assumed the power of allowing, and, consequently, of forbidding men to preach the gospel, in defiance of the Saviour's express command! This was a frightful embargo on the diffusion of Christianity; and every true Protestant may wonder that so mischievous a power was ever allowed to exist in the open gaze of an insulted world! It is extremely obvious, however, that Mr. Cartwright discovered that zeal in the cause of Christ which formed a striking contrast with the age in which he lived; and his assiduity in pastoral and ministerial duties rendered him an object of perpetual jealousy and dislike to those in power. When, therefore, the queen understood that he was restored to his ministry, though he conducted himself with unexceptionable propriety, her Majesty refused her allowance of his preaching without subscription; and it is added that her Majesty was exceedingly displeased with the archbishop for his connivance!*

Elizabeth, on this occasion, exhibited her dominant character, and, as supreme ecclesiastical governess, showed her displeasure against the highest officer in her church, for a single act of toleration not in accordance with her sovereign will! This arbitrary princess, on this occasion, refused to be instructed by her servant, the

* Paule's Whitgift, p. 71, 72.

archbishop; but, in numerous instances, she authoritatively instructed him, and all his right reverend brethren. In the case before us, though Mr. Cartwright had scrupulously observed the conditions on which he was restored to his liberty and his ministry, and had enjoyed the connivance of the primate several years, yet this potent lady interposed her royal power, and, by an act of her unbounded prerogative, reversed what he had done! By this schismatical despotism she commanded her servants, the bishops, to suspend Mr. Cartwright, and, being suspended from preaching in the churches, he preached in the hospital, where the prelates had no legal jurisdiction, and where multitudes flocked to hear him, for which they were prosecuted in the bishops' courts!*

Mr. Cartwright proved himself a peaceable and loyal subject, yielding passive, when he could not yield active, obedience. To his great honour he not only advocated, but also recognised in his own practice, the noble protestant principle of refusing to obey the commands of men when they opposed the commands of God. He was too scrupulous to obey the unrighteous injunctions of men in direct violation of the word of God. When, therefore, he was arraigned before his earthly judges and forbidden to preach in the name of Jesus, his unanswerable defence, like that of the apostles, was, that he "ought to obey God rather than men." When the bishops required subscription of Mr. Cartwright, did they not demand that obedience and submission which Jesus Christ and his apostles never required? And, by suspending him from his beloved ministry, to which God had called him, did they not assume a power which God never gave to man? did they not supersede the Saviour's administration? did they not subvert the birthright of his servant? Mr. Cartwright had consecrated himself to the ministry of Christ, which was a solemn transaction between his soul and God, and which no power on earth could dissolve. His motto was that of the apostle, "Woe be unto me, if I preach not the gospel!" This was an affair which no earthly power could counteract or disturb, without fighting against God as well as against man.

These were hard times for men of conscientious minds, who could not measure their religion by political maxims, but who, having courage and honesty, claimed the right of believing and

* Clark, p. 19, 20.

deciding for themselves, as essential to the character of rational beings. Mr. Cartwright claimed no more; and no man can claim less, without tamely yielding to the worst kind of tyranny and vassalage, and trenching on his responsibility to God. Our learned divine, being again silenced by the bishops, and again torn from his beloved flock, was invited by Lord Zouch, governor of Guernsey, to accompany him to that island, where he continued several years.*

Mr. Cartwright, as on a former occasion, resided at Castlecornet, where he was statedly employed in his beloved, ministerial work, the Lord greatly blessing his labours. There he enjoyed the friendship and patronage of Sir Thomas Leighton, who succeeded to the governorship of the island. During his abode in Guernsey, he held a friendly correspondence with several persons of eminence, among whom it would be an omission not to mention Sir Francis Hastings, Mr. James Montague, master of Sydney college, Cambridge, and Mr. Laurence Chadderton, master of Emanuel college, by each of whom he was highly esteemed and honoured.

At this period, Mr. William Bradshaw, a learned puritan minister, was invited, for a limited period, to be domestic tutor to Sir Thomas Leighton's children; and between him and Mr. Cartwright "entire affection" subsisted to the day of his death. At Mr. Bradshaw's return, he wrote to Mr. Montague, saying, "The law commandeth, that of things borrowed great care should be had in the well usage and due restoring of them; both of which we have endeavoured in Mr. Bradshaw; but the full performance must rest in your and his acceptation. His care to profit those committed to his charge, and his behaviour in the house, have been more than every one is able to esteem, and, therefore, in all respects not so fit to reward. You shall have him duly restored, with all thankfulness to your worship, by whose kindness we have enjoyed him some good time since you might have taken him away. With hearty thanks and commendations from the governor and his honourable lady, and my humble thanks for your love."†

Mr. Bradshaw, after his return to this country, travelled on horseback to the place of his intended residence, and narrowly escaped being drowned at Hawston-mills, near Cambridge, when

* Clark, p. 19, 20. † Ibid. p. 27, 28.

his horse sunk in the water to rise no more. Mr. Cartwright, in his letter to him, adverting to this remarkable escape, said, "The Lord, our most merciful Father, who delivered you from so great a death, pledges unto you deliverances hereafter; especially as the swimmer sunk like a piece of lead, and he that could no more swim than the iron-head of a scholar's hatchet was graciously borne up: therefore we have much cause to praise God that the Angel of the waters saved you. I remembered you to Sir Thomas and his lady, who told me that, if any entertainment would have holden you, they would not have suffered you to have gone from them; but they rejoiced much in your gracious escape."*

Mr. Cartwright was at Guernsey in the year 1596, and remained till 1598; but the exact time of his return does not appear on record.† The period of his visit having terminated, he doubtless returned to his beloved charge at Warwick; and he most probably enjoyed undisturbed repose the rest of his days. But he had for some years been exceedingly afflicted with the stone and gout, occasioned by hard study and lying in cold, unhealthy prisons, and, towards the close of life, his complaints increased rather than diminished; yet would he not intermit his ministerial labours, but persisted to preach when, with the utmost difficulty, he could scarcely creep into the pulpit. How different it was with too many ministers in those days, whose only object was to obtain high promotion and worldly wealth; who could not, or would not preach, nor watch over their flocks, though they received the profits. Mr. Cartwright lived not unto himself, nor to promote his own selfish purposes. He was a disinterested and faithful minister of Christ, ever willing "to spend and be spent" for the honour of God and the welfare of the people; being, as he used to say, "more concerned to *wear* out than to *rust* out." He could not endure to be a loiterer in the Lord's vineyard, but was incessantly laborious in his work. He cherished deep anxiety to do good to his fellow-creatures to the last; and, in accordance with this honourable feeling, he devoted his few remaining days to advance the highest interests of men, to which, depending on Divine assistance, he consecrated all his energies. Though he was exercised with manifold tribulations, yet he remained steadfast, and committed him-

* Clark, p. 29.

† Sutcliffe's Exam. Epis.

self unto the Lord, knowing that, when sufficiently tried, he should receive the crown of life. Though bonds and afflictions had been his portion, yet, under all his conflicts, he could say, "But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God."

Mr. Cartwright had his "conversation in heaven, from whence also he looked for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ." Earth had lost its charms, and its attractions ceased to operate on his mind. His heart was in heaven, where was his treasure and his home. His supreme solicitude had long been to promote the glory of God and the salvation of men; but now, in the prospect of death, his most solemn thoughts were turned upon himself: a personal meetness for heaven absorbed his whole attention. He had long walked with God, enjoying fellowship with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. He was conscious that his warfare was nearly accomplished: yet the prospect of appearing before the great Judge created no alarm; but, being animated by faith in the Lord Jesus, and a sanctified meetness for a better state, he rejoiced in hope of the glory of God, and enjoyed the blessed assurance of eternal life. He devoutly, yet submissively, waited for the coming of the Lord. He desired to depart and to be with Christ, which was far better; yet he could adopt the language of Job, "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come."

The people honoured Mr. Cartwright's public ministrations, which made a powerful impression on their minds; and, having witnessed his affectionate solicitude to promote their spiritual interest, they revered his name, and embraced the gospel which he preached. But, from indefatigable labours and protracted affliction, his earthly frame, at length, gave way; and, having faithfully discharged his official duties, he left the world in peace.* He suffered not from protracted confinement by his last affliction; but, the Lord's day preceding his departure, he preached his last sermon from Eccl. xii. 7: "Then shall the dust return to the earth, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." The subject was singularly appropriate, directing him to contemplate, with deep solemnity,

* Cartwright's Prov. Ded.

the invisible realities of heaven and eternity; and it might not be unfitly denominated his own funeral sermon. While he called the attention of his audience to the solemn consideration of death, and the vast importance of a preparation for that momentous change, the subject furnished a lesson peculiarly seasonable to himself; and doubtless, his mind was powerfully absorbed with the interesting instructions, being fully aware that his dissolution was at hand.

The Tuesday morning following, he spent two hours prostrate on his knees in humble and importunate prayer to God; and this, it would seem, was the last time of his holding communion with God on earth. The season was peculiarly solemn, interesting, and profitable. He beheld the glory of the Lord and the power of his love, and experienced remarkable transports of joy. Having finished his devotions, he informed Mrs. Cartwright that he had found "unutterable comfort and happiness, and that God had given him a glimpse of heaven" before he was called to enter that blessed state; and he was enabled to exclaim, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day." In a few hours, the earthly house of his tabernacle was dissolved, and his happy spirit entered on the joy of its Lord. Mr. Cartwright died, triumphing in the Redeemer, December 27, 1603, aged sixty-eight years. His death was sudden; but he had no fear of death. He knew whom he had believed; and to meet the king of terrors was no terror to his heaven-born spirit—to live was Christ—to die was gain! Through life, he sought not his own things, but the things which were Jesus Christ's; and he consecrated his time and energies to advance the welfare of souls. He was not forsaken in the trying hour; but, animated with the prospect and foretaste of heaven, he could say, "I know that my Redeemer liveth."

Notwithstanding the languishing state of his body, he was the same in life and death. His last hours were spent in a holy preparation for heaven; and his confidence being fixed on Christ, he enjoyed inexpressible consolation, with an assurance of that "rest which remaineth for the people of God." He had been driven from one country to another, carried from one prison to another, and treated as an outcast; but his toils and sufferings were ended,

and, with unutterable joy, he was called to the possession of "an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for him." His happy spirit, being released from earthly warfare, was translated to dwell "with the spirits of just men made perfect." He ceased to weep and mourn, to endure sorrow and affliction, to bewail sin and temptation, for the former things had passed away. He had confessed Christ before men, so Christ confessed him before the Father; and, being placed beyond the reach of former trials, he was assured that neither "tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, nor sword," would ever separate him from the love of Christ. "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God; and he shall go no more out." His remains were deposited in St. Mary's church, Warwick; and, on that mournful occasion, his beloved friend, Mr. John Dod, preached his funeral sermon.* Archbishop Whitgift, his great antagonist, survived him only a little more than two months. The new sovereign assumed the principal management of "clergy affairs;" and historians have recorded that, when King James began to find fault with some things in the liturgy, and intimate that it was convenient they should be altered, the archbishop *died of grief,* declaring he had rather give up his bishopric to God than hold it any longer among men.† Mr. Cartwright was succeeded in the mastership of the hospital by Mr. Simon Buttrys in 1603, who was succeeded by Mr. Edward Lord in 1605, and who continued till 1616.‡

To exhibit a complete moral portrait of Mr. Cartwright, all the features of his character must be delineated. It will be proper, therefore, to remind the reader that his views of religious liberty were defective, owing chiefly to his not carrying out his principles to their ultimate extent. He powerfully defended the cause of ecclesiastical reform, and, from reasons which no arguments could resist, he proved the unscriptural character of the episcopal establishment, together with its multiplied abuses and oppressions; but instead of carrying out the principle of freedom to its legitimate extent, he sought to obtain another kind of establishment, which

* Clark, p. 21, 22.

† Kennet's Hist. vol. ii. p. 642; Soame's Elizabeth, p. 555; Middleton, vol. ii. 351.

‡ Strypes' Whitgift, p. 554; West's Warwick, p. 655.

must have been founded on legislative and compulsory enactment. Had Mr. Cartwright's acute and penetrating mind grasped the whole subject, and had he employed his powerful intellect in defending the independence of Christian churches as based on Divine authority, his name and his principles would have secured to him the highest applause from a discerning posterity.

Notwithstanding this deficiency, he not only maintained the principles of reform in the most trying circumstances, but also refused every stipulation to sacrifice conscience or relinquish the truth of God. What he believed to be religious truth, he could not compromise for human favour or worldly gain. Many of his opinions may be collected from the foregoing pages; yet it will be necessary to lay before the reader a condensed view of the leading principles by which his name was so eminently distinguished. He considered the truths he embraced as constituting prominent features of the gospel, and the cause he espoused as the cause of God, from which no consideration on earth could divert his attention or rend his attachment; and no enlightened protestant can doubt that he had an indubitable right to his religious opinions, equally with the Archbishop of Canterbury himself. The following sentiments, expressed in his own words, will doubtless be acceptable to the reader:—

"We praise God," said he, "for the present reformation of the church, so far as it is agreeable to his word. We are glad the word of God is preached, and the sacraments are administered; but we desire that which is wanting may be added, that which is superfluous may be cut off, and that all may be done according to the institution of the apostles. The things which we defend are such that, if every hair of our heads were a life, we ought to give up all for the defence of them! We make no separation in the church, but attempt to separate all those things which offend the church, that all, being united in the unadulterated doctrines of the gospel, may be more closely joined together in all the bonds of truth."*

Mr. Cartwright was assured that Jesus Christ came not to erect a worldly, but a *spiritual* kingdom, and that he pressed those instructions upon the people which promoted their spiritual improvement and their meetness for heaven; but he never interfered with

* Cartwright's Replye, p. 15—17.

the governments of the world, nor admitted the right of earthly governments to interfere with the affairs of his kingdom. Mr. Cartwright was unable to comprehend how the measures adopted by the bishops could promote spiritual religion; but the ecclesiastical machinery appeared admirably constructed to disgrace religion, by adopting a system of human expediency, worldly policy, and severe intolerance, instead of the gospel of Jesus Christ. The lofty claim, in his opinion, degraded the truth and authority of the Bible, involving a manifest assumption of the Saviour's supremacy. He had no doubt that those who exercised this authority placed themselves in a forbidden position, "As being lords over God's heritage," instead of "being examples to the flock;" and, in these circumstances, their minds seemed to "be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."

Mr. Cartwright concluded that the apostles were guided by wisdom from above in the organization of churches, which, being simple in form, were in perfect adaptation to the exigences of society. Those institutions, derived from this high authority, commended themselves to all classes of men, rich and poor, learned and unlearned; and converts were gathered from every form of government, every species of superstition, and every condition of life. The spiritual character, elevating influence, holy requirements, and sacred immunities of the apostolic churches were placed far remote from the obtrusion of earthly power, and from every species of worldly expediency. Mr. Cartwright, therefore, considered them as undoubted patterns of imitation.

He had strong objections against the method of providing ministers in the Anglican church, and was a firm advocate of the free choice of Christian pastors, as the natural and inalienable prerogative of every Christian church, which was intimately connected with interests high as heaven, and lasting as eternity. His soul revolted at the pluralities and non-residence sanctioned in the Established Church, as contrary to the will of God and extremely prejudicial to pastoral fidelity and usefulness. He had the strongest objections against the imposition of the Book of Common-prayer, and considered the enforcement of rites and ceremonies as opposed to the purity and simplicity of the gospel. His understanding and conscience impelled him to disapprove the pompous

train of officers in the Church of England as derived from the papal church, and not from apostolical authority; while the lordly domination of the bishops appeared to be an oppressive infringement on the rights of conscience, a manifest usurpation of the authority of Jesus Christ, and opposed to the spirit and instructions of the New Testament.

Mr. Cartwright believed that Jesus Christ prohibited his ministers from exercising lordship over their brethren, reserving to Himself supreme jurisdiction in all spiritual matters; and, having furnished all the laws, offices, and ordinances pertaining to his churches, he authorized his servants to explain and enforce, by every means of persuasion, whatsoever he appointed to be promulgated. The revealed will of the Great Lawgiver, therefore, was, in his opinion, the only rule of obedience on all points of doctrine and in all matters of ecclesiastical order and discipline. He was assured that the religion of Christ was not a system of expediency, to be regulated by the discretion of man, but immutable truth and obligation, as contained in the oracles of God. He believed that the civil magistrate was authorized to punish *civil* offences, but that Jesus Christ never authorized him to inflict civil penalties for supposed disobedience in religion.

He had no doubt that the liberty enjoyed by the apostolic churches was the gift of God, and not to be conceded to any power on earth. It was, in his opinion, the duty of every one to embrace the gospel from conviction and choice; and the prerogative of licensing men to perform duties which they owed to God, could not belong to mortals! He was assured that the power of governing the churches could neither be derived from the people nor from the commission of princes; but, in his opinion, the high prerogative belonged exclusively to the Son of God, who, having entrusted the executive to his servants, mercifully prescribed, and permanently fixed, the holy administration to be observed to the end of the world. In matters of faith and worship, Mr. Cartwright could not consider the churches of Christ as controllable by any earthly power, but under entire subjection to Jesus Christ. "As Christ is the head of the church, and the Saviour of the body, therefore the church is *subject unto Christ.*" He who redeemed the church, and brought it into existence, was invested with its

entire administration; therefore Mr. Cartwright concluded that churches were under *spiritual* jurisdiction of Christ, and under earthly rulers only in *civil* matters. He believed that the legislation of the New Testament constituted their only legitimate government, a few peculiarities of which may be enumerated: "The Lord hath ordained that they who preach the gospel shall live of the gospel."—"Esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake, and be at peace among yourselves."—"Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ."—"If any man be overtaken in a fault, ye who are spiritual restore such a one in the spirit of meekness."—"Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses."—"Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear."—If an offending brother "neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."—"A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject."—"Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person."

These enactments, with numerous others, were expressly appointed for the government of the churches; but Mr. Cartwright could also appeal to apostolic precedent in confirmation of this important fact. The apostles addressed their epistles to the churches as collective bodies, and as brethren in Christ. They disclaimed all coercive authority over the churches, and invested each of them with the entire management of its own affairs, in obedience to the will of Christ. They considered the churches as the depositories of inspired truth, and recognised their right to propagate the gospel, as well as to appreciate its benefits. They acknowledged the churches to be formed on conviction and choice, and intended to promote "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." They treated the churches as distinst religious communities, founded for the promulgation of Christianity and the glory of Christ. They exhorted the churches to deeds of benevolence, but left them to dispose of their own goods. They furnished the churches with the prerogative of choosing their own officers. They recognised the right of churches to send out sufficiently qualified teachers. And they exhorted the churches to exercise the prescribed discipline over their own members.

Since these precepts and examples were permanently binding on

the churches, and intended to promote their spiritual improvement to the end of time, those churches which refused obedience, whether in former or later times, betrayed a direct departure from the word of God, and substituted some other scheme devised by man. Mr. Cartwright, therefore, had no doubt that the ecclesiastical code interspersed in the New Testament was complete—that there was nothing wanting—nothing superfluous. Additions, in his opinion, were incumbrances and deformities, and deductions marred its beauty and weakened its influence. He was assured that these ecclesiastical enactments were identified with the gospel, and essential features in the Saviour's administration; also that the scheme of government was perfect and unalterable. He, moreover, considered every deviation from this holy code, not only as *dissent* from inspired truth, but also as unsafe, because untrue, and not failing to dishonour and corrupt the gospel of Christ. He believed that the Saviour's administration extended to the thoughts and purposes, the affections and consciences of his subjects, claiming devout and unceasing obedience to his requirements. He considered it to be the height of injustice to interfere between the soul and God; and the fact, in his opinion, rested on indisputable authority, that the ministers of Christ, how exalted soever their stations, were not lords and masters, but "stewards" and "servants" employed to promote the honour of their Lord and King, being required to carry out that which he had provided, and to observe in all things his unerring administration as prescribed in his holy word.

He, moreover, believed that, in the apostolic rites of worship and rules of government, there was little to excite ambition or aggrandizement, but sufficient to regulate their spiritual fraternities. This was in perfect harmony with the Saviour's administration, and strikingly illustrated by his unostentatious example. The primitive churches were forbidden to exercise authority over one another; and, seeing the laws of Christ were the laws of the churches, and were espoused by the body of the members, they were appointed to be administered by their respective officers, not as lords, but as His servants, and executors of His righteous will.

Mr. Cartwright exceedingly deplored the enforcement of diocesan episcopacy, not only as derived from popery, and nourishing

some of its most dangerous errors, but also as subverting the ecclesiastical government appointed by Jesus Christ, and tending to the injury of his churches. The penalties and proceedings of the High-commission were frightful, which he considered as manifestly *dissenting* from the word of God, destructive of the birthright of Christians, and disgraceful to a protestant country!

He had too convincing evidence that the Established Church assumed a compulsory and despotic power, in too great accordance with the Church of Rome, to which his judgment and conscience would not allow him to submit; and, notwithstanding the terrific penalties to enforce its demands, he appealed from carly traditions, ecclesiastical canons, and all other human edicts, to the decisions of the word of God. This, to him, was no dubious question. He believed that unreserved subjection to Divine authority was the first principle of Christianity, and that the gospel furnished the only legitimate prescriptions of ecclesiastical government. He was equally satisfied that, in such concerns, the authority and sufficiency of inspired truth absolutely superseded and rendered nugatory the traditions and commandments of men. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." He was, therefore, assured that it was at his peril to surrender his judgment and conscience to the keeping or dictation of man.

The Christian religion, according to Mr. Cartwright, was not intended to compress the minds of men into the same mould—to encourage the pride of ascendancy and oppression—to enforce the law of compulsion and degradation—to sanction the infliction of temporal punishment for supposed offences in religion—to advance the Redeemer's kingdom by an extension of territorial boundaries; all of which he repudiated as libels on Christianity and acts of hostility against its Author. These, being the contrivances of men, were interruptions to the progress of religion; but Christianity, in his opinion, was a scheme of mercy to bless mankind, not to enrich the priesthood.

Mr. Cartwright agreed with Bishop Jewel that Jesus Christ was the *only* head of the church; that no creature on earth possessed the requisite qualifications for that responsible trust; and that the Lord Jesus, who possessed those qualifications, was su-

preme Lord of his church. He believed that the church of Christ was the kingdom of Christ; that Christ himself was sole King, Lawgiver, and Judge in the great affairs of conscience and salvation; that to Him *alone* were men responsible in all matters of faith and worship; and that He rightfully demanded obedience of all his subjects. He considered himself accountable to the Lord Jesus, and not to any other; nor could he acknowledge any rival, or any partner, whether prelate, prince, or pope. He could not in such matters recognise the power of any creature, without surrendering the dearest immunities of the gospel and relinquishing the sacred obligations which he owed to God. He could not exchange his responsibility to God for the worst kind of servitude to man, nor barter his conscience for secular advantage. He, therefore, resolved to cherish a clear conscience, whatsoever it might cost him, and agreed, with the memorable Hales, "That it was a fearful thing to trifle with conscience," the enormity of which was, in those times, so little regarded!

He considered religious freedom as founded on immutable justice, Divine prescription, and apostolic example; nor could he reconcile this fundamental principle to the compulsory enforcement of religious worship. The measures then adopted, instead of securing unrestricted freedom, subverted the right of private judgment, and placed the people and their religion in a position forbidden by Jesus Christ, binding them in state fetters! Mr. Cartwright concluded that Christ not only bequeathed perfect freedom to his people, but also furnished the specific order, government, and immunities of his churches; he, therefore, conceived it could not be wrong to obey his instructions. When men claimed the power of devising and instituting new laws in Christian churches, they more than insinuated that they esteemed too highly their own wisdom, and in like proportion depreciated the wisdom of Jesus Christ.

The truth of God, in his judgment, was the perfect law of his churches, which were under obligation to renounce every other authority as inappropriate and unwarrantable. Mr. Cartwright believed that the gospel *alone* was adapted to the exigences of the churches, and furnished their only doctrine and administration, with the promised blessings; therefore, to employ the gospel

for these important purposes was one of the highest duties required of man. He considered that secular governments had their specific province, which related exclusively to earthly kingdoms; but that the kingdom of Christ was not earthly, but spiritual, having originated in spiritual wisdom and mercy, being sustained by spiritual authority, founded on spiritual enactments, intended for spiritual purposes, and appointed for spiritual benefits. This, in his view, constituted an important distinction from all earthly kingdoms. Though, in those times, few persons appreciated, or even understood this distinction, yet Mr. Cartwright could not forbear concluding that coercive authority was utterly powerless, except in doing mischief, that it subverted and destroyed the spiritual character of the churches, and that all such authority was repudiated in the New Testament. "If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world," the apostle asks, "why are ye subject to ordinances, after the commandments and doctrines of men;" adding, "Touch not; taste not; handle not; which all are to perish with the using."

Mr. Cartwright distinctly understood that the right of exercising his judgment and conscience, of believing and propagating the gospel, of worshipping and honouring God, was a boon not conferred by human favour, but derived from Heaven, and was every man's unlicensed and inalienable property. He stood on this rock; and, in his opinion, those who, by compulsory acts, destroyed, or even diminished this property, committed two great evils—depredation on the highest interests of man, and fearful encroachment on the prerogative of God. Men in high stations, instead of recognising this property as sacred to every living man, employed their power to degrade and destroy it; yet, while molesting and tormenting others, they brought no small disrepute upon themselves. Mr. Cartwright unhesitatingly rejected this prostration of soul, and resolutely claimed the use of his intellect on all religious subjects, cheerfully allowing similar freedom to others. He furnished sufficient evidence of his adhesion to this sacred principle, and acknowledged, in religion, his exclusive responsibility to God. He had no doubt that the apostolic churches, in religious matters, acknowledged no authority but that of Jesus Christ, owned no religious legislation but that contained in the

Bible, admitted no doctrines or observances but those stated in Scripture, and advanced no ministerial pretensions but those furnished by inspired truth; all of which was far remote from priestly ascendancy or the intrusion of secular power. He, moreover, considered that every departure from the ecclesiastical polity laid down in the New Testament constituted *dissent* from the gospel of Christ, and, to the same extent, appreciated the corruptions of the world; which could not fail to be dishonourable to Christianity and prejudicial to its character and its benefits. He was therefore assured that, when Christian churches embraced those doctrines, or enforced those observances which were not enforced in Scripture, they so far disowned the authority of Christ and substituted the inventions of men, by which they formed ecclesiastical incorporations veering toward the errors and superstitions of the dark ages. He believed that Jesus Christ appointed his ministers to preach the gospel, and to administer his ordinances; but that he never sanctioned those disgusting observances which have been so much admired in later times. He considered the Bible as containing the religion of Christ. This was the polar star by which he steered his adventurous course, assailed by bigotry and borne down by persecution.

This was not the age for discovering all the multifarious errors and abuses in the system. Mr. Cartwright detected numerous corruptions, originating in the exercise of human power and legislation in the church of God; and he probably made as extensive discoveries as could, in his circumstances, have been rationally expected. His object in making known the blemishes of the hierarchy was not to obtain a spiritual victory, nor to widen the breach among Christians; and no one will doubt that he was a zealous and untiring advocate of reform, for the attainment of which he discovered laborious and praiseworthy exertions. His celebrity as an author, a scholar, a divine, and a sufferer for Christ, may be questioned by the patrons of error and persecution, but will no doubt be fully appreciated by the friends of truth and freedom. His reputation stood so high, and his character obtained such great esteem, that it is said there was not a person of quality and piety, or of any degree of eminence in literature and religion, who did not seek his acquaintance and the advantage of his conversa-

tion, from which, since an unprofitable word rarely fell from his lips, they derived grateful pleasure and unspeakable satisfaction.* He obtained a distinguished reputation as a preacher, especially among the learned at Cambridge; and it is recorded that, after long absence, Mr. Cartwright, visiting the university, was importuned to preach on a week-day at St. Mary's church, where a vast concourse of all ranks flocked to hear him; and grave men, it is said, "ran like boys in the streets to obtain places in the church." Mr. Cartwright, after sermon, dined with his old friend Mr. Lawrence Chadderton, where many persons resorted to see and hear him.†

Notwithstanding his high character and reputation, his vigorous and uncompromising resistance of ecclesiastical intolerance, and his other ennobling qualifications, for which he was so much admired, his name is bespattered and his character severely censured by the pens of certain historians. His pre-eminent excellencies were no protection against the poison of bigotry and the voice of slander. As the reader must have already witnessed, there were few persons, if any, whose name and character, whose learning and piety, whose principles and intentions were treated with so much obloquy and scorn. Without noticing the bitter invectives of Bancroft, Heylin, Nichols, and others of the same school, it will not be improper to state the imputations derived from writers of greater respectability. One of this class calls him "the standard-bearer of the puritans" and declares that "he was the first in the Church of England who began to pray extempore before sermon."‡ Another styles him "the first broacher of puritanism, and the chief head of the puritan faction;" adding, "that he was a man of a bold spirit and of a running pen." A third unhesitatingly declares "that he infected those parts of the country where he lived with his dangerous errors, which afterwards overthrew the Church of England!"§

The reader may be somewhat amused with the statement of a right reverend prelate, who, in defence of Sunday sports, says, that he should not presume to trouble his reader by "raking into the old kennels of Thomas Cartwright;" and that "the Sabbatarian

* Clark, p. 19. † Ibid. p. 22. ‡ Dugdale's Warwick. vol. i. p. 443.
§ Strype's Parker, Pref.; Aylmer, p. 116; Baker's MSS. vol. xxviii. p. 445.

controversy, ever since Thomas Cartwright's unlucky days, hath disquieted both church and state!"* And it is further stated that Henry Barrow, the Brownist, who suffered death for nonconformity, derived his doctrine principally from Mr. Cartwright, "maintaining, among other things, that the Church of England was not a true church, that her ministers had no lawful calling, and that the use of forms of prayer was blasphemous!"† But the fact is that Mr. Cartwright never propagated, but opposed these doctrines; and the reader has already seen that he wrote against the Brownists.

It is unnecessary to make any further comment on these representations, since the reader will find no difficulty in forming his own judgment and pronouncing an unbiassed sentence. Some other writers have ventured to insinuate that Mr. Cartwright, before his death, renounced the principles of nonconformity, and confessed he had been guilty of schism; for which, however, they have not furnished the least particle of satisfactory evidence, but what they have insinuated is opposed by all the actions of his life. If any such evidence existed, Sir George Paule, his inveterate enemy, who lived in those times, would assuredly have collected such memorial to have enabled him to degrade the character of our divine. Whereas, all that this bitter opponent intimates is that Archbishop Whitgift had been *heard to say*, that if Mr. Cartwright had not so far engaged at the beginning, he *thought*, verily, that he would, in the latter part of his life, have been drawn to conformity.‡

This, however, was the age of ingenuity, which, being associated with men's evil passions, was remarkably prolific concerning Mr. Cartwright. A *report* was propagated after his death that he had seriously lamented, on his death-bed, the unnecessary troubles he had been the means of fomenting in the church; and wished he had to begin his life again, that he might testify to the world how much he disliked his former course, and, according to this report, in this opinion he died!§ This is a precious story to certain writers, who demand satisfactory evidence except where it is wanted. The late Dr. Southey not only discovered too great a fondness for this silly report, but also made convenient *additions* to it, declaring,

* White's Treatise, Ded. † Walton's Lives, p. 298. ‡ Paule's Whitgift, p. 71.
§ Strype's Whitgift, p. 554.

as undubitable facts, that Mr. Cartwright, more than any other individual, had contributed to excite and diffuse the spirit of resistance and dissension; that clemency had softened him, and merciful usage produced contrition in his mind; that his latter years were passed in dutiful and peaceful conformity; that, at death, he lamented the troubles which he had raised in the church, by promoting an unnecessary schism; and that he wished he could begin his life again, that he might testify how deeply he disapproved of his former ways!*

This statement, plausible as it may seem, is not only partial, but also untrue. The fact has already appeared, probably to the reader's entire satisfaction, that Mr. Cartwright never excited nor diffused the spirit of "resistance and dissension;" and that, if such spirit was either excited or diffused, it was not by him, but by grievous oppression and persecution. Nor was there ever the least evidence that he spent his latter years in "dutiful conformity" to the church, which is the contrivance of his enemies; and the supposed "schism" with which he is here accused, if it existed at all, it was obviously created and fomented, not by Mr. Cartwright, but by those antichristian severities which never fail to produce these unhappy results. The reader will find no difficulty in ascertaining what degree of "clemency" and "merciful usage" was employed in his favour! But that which stands most prominent in this caricature, though a mere *rumour*, is changed into an *historical fact;* and thus it is made to comport with the details of sober history, and also the basis on which to found so grave a detail of accusations! The reader, however, ought to recollect that Mr. Cartwright lived and died at a time when ignorance and party-prejudice constituted the leading characteristics of the people; so that persons, under the influence of these unhappy tempers, would be sufficiently disposed to indulge an uncontrollable propensity to censure him. Can we suppose that persons, governed by these propensities, and residing at Warwick, would forget to censure him when his remains were laid in the tomb? After his death, they would take the liberty of propagating any report that best suited their wishes or promoted their interests; and this was naturally to be expected, when it is recollected in what cause he had so distinguished him-

* Book of the Church, vol. ii. p. 302.

self. But if we were to place implicit credit, or even the least degree of credit, in silly reports of the dead, and state them, like Dr. Southey, as authenticated facts, their true characters could never be ascertained.

It will not be improper to examine the grounds of this insidious story. An impartial dignitary of the church has furnished very judicious observations on this subject. Mr. Cartwright, he remarks, was a formidable adversary, and, out of question, one of the most learned divines of his time. All concessions from such a man, therefore, must have been very valuable to the contrary party, when they could be obtained. When they could not, Mr. Cartwright was considered "a dealer in words, but barren in matter, a man perfectly childish, holding opinions with papists." But, our author inquires, whence did the above rumour originate? About the year 1662, Sir Henry Yelverton published a little posthumous piece written by Bishop Morton, accompanied with his own preface, in which he furnished the reader with an account of this rumour. But how came Sir Henry by this important information? Why, it is stated that "a sober person told it to one in Warwick, and that one in Warwick told it to Sir Henry Yelverton;" and out it came for the *first* time, with these attestations, nearly *sixty* years after Mr. Cartwright's death! The venerable archdeacon reminds his opponent that he "glibly swallowed" this sweet morsel, so did Dr. Southey and others, to which they were welcome; but our author wishes them not to suppose that all persons have so voracious appetites and throats of so large dimensions.*

Another judicious author has reflected so great honour on the memory of Mr. Cartwright that it would be doing injustice to the reader, as well as to our venerable puritan, to withhold his interesting testimony. This distinguished puritan, he observes, possessed learning and capacity which fitted him for any station in the church; but he exposed himself through nearly half a century to poverty, exile, and complicated sufferings, in defence of what he considered the cause and truth of God. All men, and especially men whose ardent temperament fits them to become leaders, have their imperfections; and this is the only rational view to be entertained respecting the conduct of Mr. Cartwright. That he re-

* Blackburne's Works, vol. vi. p. 239.

pented on his death-bed of the course he had pursued is an unauthenticated rumour, to which the facts of his life were opposed. His silence towards the close of his days arose more from hopelessness of success than from change of principle; for he had learned that to conquer from the press there was no encouraging prospect from the personage who occupied the throne of ecclesiastical supremacy. Had his mantle fallen on another at the queen's death, it is not easy to say what effects might have followed.* The historian Fuller observes that some thought Mr. Cartwright regretted that different sects shrouded and sheltered themselves under his protection, which he could neither sanction nor reject, and which made him by degrees to decline them altogether. He adds "that others were of opinion that he was not more remiss, but more reserved, being still as sound, but not as sharp in the cause, out of politic intentions; like a skilful pilot in a great tempest, suffering himself to be carried away for a time by the violence of the storm, but waiting till the wind turned to the north, and blew him in a prosperous gale according to his desires."†

It will not be deemed improper to notice another occurrence on public record, which is too obviously intended to degrade our puritan Reformer. A modern writer observes that Mr. Cartwright, in his correspondence with Sir Michael Hicks, said, "that prayer was as it were a bunch of keys, whereby we go to all the treasures and storehouses of the Lord, his butteries, his pantries, his cellars, his wardrobe."‡ Writers like this ought to be very cautious and sparing in the reflections which they make on men's characters, since they are in danger of misleading unwary readers by not furnishing those facts which would enable them to correct the mistakes which they obtrude on the public. We are enabled, in the present instance, to supply the reader with all the necessary information. Sir Michael Hicks, the friend and patron of Mr. Cartwright, having desired his instructions on the duty of prayer, and that he would provide him with a certain form for his use, Mr. Cartwright, being then in the Island of Guernsey, sent him the following modest letter:—

"Prayer being, as it were, a bunch of keys, whereby to go to all

* Vaughan's Stuarts, vol. i. p. 73. † Fuller, b. x. p. 3. ‡ Churton's Nowell, p. 225.

the treasures and storehouses of the Lord, his butteries, his pantries, his cellars, his wardrobe, and whatever is needful either for this life or for the life to come, it is Christian wisdom in you to inquire after the skill and knowledge of it. And it giveth you some comfort in being led by the same Spirit as the apostles of our Saviour Christ were when they desired him to teach them how to pray. Howbeit, you held not the same tenor of wisdom in addressing yourself to me for instruction and direction in it; as to one who findeth no contentment in mine own prayers, therefore, unable to give satisfaction to others, especially to you, who, having so many forms of excellent prayers printed before you, seek some further help than those worthy prayers will afford. I had purposed reserving some heads, to have drawn you a shorter form to have used when the suddenness of your affairs would not suffer you to be so large; but this is a thing that you may easily do yourself, and the present time, which is short, would not suffer me to do. Thus, being ready either in this or any other thing in my power to show forth my thankful remembrance of you, I commit you to the gracious keeping and blessing of God. Guernsey, the 30th of September, 1595. Your's to command in the Lord."*

Here the reader has the whole case brought before him; but to have told the whole story probably would not have suited the purpose of the accuser. Mr. Cartwright, in a familiar correspondence, undoubtedly used the words in question; and what does the fact prove? This style of writing was too much the taste of those times; but our author animadverts on the few quaint words, as containing almost every thing degrading to the writer. He had no sooner recited those few expressions than he broke out into a strain of triumphant interrogation, "Does fanaticism extinguish all taste and judgment? or is it only in minds originally weak that infection can fix itself? Which ever way the reader may solve the problem, he will naturally ask, Was this the man that was to improve what had been done by Cranmer and Ridley, by Parker and Nowell, and their coadjutors? to give us a form of worship more pure and edifying, more dignified and devout?" Were the arrangements of these Reformers, then, surpassing improvement? This pompous

* Lansdowne MSS. vol. lxxix. art. 25.

and partial writer did not stop here; but, feeling the poetic fire, he immediately asks,—

> "Is this the region, this the soil, this the clime,
> That we must change for heaven? this mournful gloom
> For that celestial light?"*

It will be readily acknowledged that so much bombast, scurility, and misrepresentation is rarely found within so small a compass. The reader will, at the same time, clearly perceive that this disgusting philipic represents the Church of England, if not above perfection, most certainly beyond the possibility of amendment; and that this writer too obviously intended to blacken the character and disgrace the memory of the man who was justly esteemed one of the most celebrated divines, and one of the brightest ornaments, of the age in which he lived. What could be more execrable?

It is, moreover, ungenerously stated that Mr. Cartwright, towards the close of life, grew rich.† But it is extremely improbable that his riches increased on a scale, or in a manner, at all disreputable to his character. The mistaken authors here cited are in some degree excusable, since the stigma of growing rich does not appear to have been their contrivance, but derived from the unworthy pen of Dr. Sutcliffe, who, having censured the puritans for their *wandering* ministry, when they were *expelled* from the churches, endeavoured next to blacken the memory of our divine. Thomas Cartwright, said he, "is too stout-hearted to wander any more, or to gather crumbs under other men's tables, and, like a wise fellow, hath purchased more in persecution than any minister in England in so short a space in his greatest prosperity. Yet if, to his hospital and other purchase, he could add some hundred pounds pension, I think he will find no text against it; and, therefore, they say he is still underhand thundering out praises of his discipline!"‡

The publication of these strictures was rather unseasonable for the doctor, since Mr. Cartwright was then groaning in close prison! An advocate of the prisoner rebuked him, by inquiring of Matthew Sutcliffe, who was always carping at Mr. Cartwright's purchase,

* Churton's Nowell, p. 225. † Paule's Whitgift, p. 72; Strype's Whitgift, p. 554.
‡ Sutcliffe's Eccl. Dis. Pref.

why might not Mr. Cartwright sell the lands he had received from his father, and buy others with the money, as well as some of the bishops? To which Dean Sutcliffe replied that he neither carped always, nor even once at Mr. Cartwright's purchase; adding, "Let him purchase and buy at pleasure. I hinder him not; I envy him not. Only this I must tell him, as I once did, that Mr. Cartwright, a man that hath more lands of his own in possession than any bishop that I know, and that fareth daintily every day, and feedeth fair and fat, and lieth as soft as any tenderling of that brood, and hath won as much wealth in a short time, and will leave more to his posterity than *any bishop*, should not cry out either of persecution or of the excess of bishops' livings, whose poverty I might, but I will not disclose. He is a most happy man," the doctor adds, "that, with selling a cottage, and so much ground as would scarcely graze three goslings, worth at the uttermost but twenty nobles yearly, can purchase two or three hundred marks of land; and gladly would I learn that secret."* The doctor accused Mr. Cartwright not only of the want of hospitality and of charity, but also of penuriousness, by accumulating wealth to enrich his family. He likewise observed that few of the bishops could be compared to Mr. Cartwright and his fellows, "who, under pretence of refusing livings, had, by begging, and whining, and shifting, and complaining of persecution, enriched themselves and their children, while the bishops had scarcely been able to bear the expense of their offices!"†

Without adverting to the general splendour and wealth of the prelates of those times, Dean Sutcliffe was doubtless well acquainted with Aylmer, Bishop of London, who, in addition to large sums on mortgage, purchased lands to the amount of *sixteen thousand* pounds not long before his death!‡ Mr. Cartwright's annual income, arising from his annuity and the mastership of the hospital, amounted to one hundred pounds. His circumstances, we are told, notwithstanding Sutcliffe's statements, obliged him to sell his patrimonial estate at Waddon, in Cambridgeshire; that, on the same account, Mrs. Cartwright had been induced to enter into business; and even his bitter accuser informs us that the sale of

* Brydges' Restituta, vol i. p. 465. † Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 54.
‡ Strype's Aylmer, p. 172, 194,

the house and land derived from his father produced only thirty pounds a-year.* But historians, to make the story of his accumulating wealth the more plausible, say that Mr. Cartwright was enriched by the wealth and bounty of his numerous wealthy friends. Fuller quaintly remarks, "One saith, as for riches he sought them not; and another, that he died rich: and I believe both say true. God sometimes maketh wealth to *find* them who seek not for it; seeing many and great were his benefactors."†

The imputation of growing rich passed, we suppose unintentionally, a very high encomium on Mr. Cartwright, who must have been an extraordinary man to be so highly revered by persons of wealth, and so extensively replenished with their gifts! He had not, however, the least concern to be rich, and the love of wealth constituted no part of his character. He never sought to accumulate worldly possessions, but often declined favourable opportunities of obtaining them; and he chose not, but refused promotion and wealth when offered him. This noble disinterestedness formed a prominent and durable feature in his character, and was conspicuously displayed in his practice. He had, it is admitted, numerous presents of gold; and he usually took a small portion, lest he should seem to slight the kindness of his friends, but returned the remainder, with suitable grateful acknowledgments, professing that, in the condition wherein God had placed him, he was equally content as they in possession of dignity and wealth.

This part of his character may be further delineated by facts. The reader has been already reminded that Mr. Cartwright received a handsome present of money from Mr. Hicks, at a season when his prospects were the most gloomy; but, having gratefully retained a part, he returned the rest, with unfeigned thanks to the generous donor.—When he was preacher to the merchants at Antwerp, and having found by their losses that their property was in a declining state, he generously returned them the salary which they allowed him for serving them.—When persecution forced him a second time into exile, he committed the superintendence of the hospital to Mr. Edward Lord, minister of Woolston, near Coventry, to whom he allowed greatest part of the profits, and caused the remainder to be distributed among the poor.—When he was a pri-

* Cunningham's Lives, vol. ii. p. 224; Sutcliffe's Exam. p. 52. † Worthes, part ii. p. 27.

soner in the Fleet, a present of thirty pounds was sent him by one of the nobility; but he took only ten shillings, returning the rest to the honourable donor, with many affectionate and grateful acknowledgments.—When King James of Scotland pressed him to accept the professor's chair in the university of St. Andrew's, and when the Archbishop of Dublin invited him into Ireland, offering him preferment in that country, Mr. Cartwright thankfully and politely declined their generous offers.—And when the Earl of Leicester offered him the provostship of Eaton college, saying, "it was one hundred pounds a-year more than enough, besides the conveniency of the place," our generous patriot, declining the offer, replied, "that the hundred pounds more than enough was enough for him."*

The man of whom these facts could with truth be recorded must have possessed a character of no ordinary excellence—a character not unworthy of the admiration and imitation of posterity. Dr. Sutcliffe's statements, therefore, when compared with facts, vanish as vapour and smoke; and it is recorded that the doctor, on his death-bed, repented having written so much against the puritans!† Mr. Cartwright, towards the close of life, declined all controversy, lived in quietude and retirement from the world, devoted himself to ardent religious studies, and manifested great moderation. He had been borne down in a just cause by the strong arm of power; therefore his only hope and appeal was to that court where there is no respect of persons, no accepting of bribes, no corruption, and where no delusion can ever enter. There, he knew, the hope of the oppressed would not perish, but every man's cause be heard, and every man's wrong be righted. His grey hairs, but especially his growing infirmities, forcibly reminded him of his approaching dissolution; and, like a true man of God, he directed his remaining contemplations and pursuits to a suitable preparation for death.

He was indefatigably laborious through life, and a constant and zealous preacher whenever he enjoyed his liberty. In his ministerial exercises at Warwick, besides taking constant care of the poor in the hospital, by catechising them, praying with them, and attending to the other concerns of the institution, he often preached at both churches on the Lord's-day, and at one of them on the

* Clark, p. 18—21. † Ward's Diary, p. 181.

Saturday. This he did as an act of pure charity, without receiving or expecting the least pecuniary remuneration for his services. Nor ought it to be forgotten that his labours were not in vain, but, though often interrupted, they were accompanied with the smiles and blessing of God, and made extensively useful to the people.*

Preaching the gospel was his habitual delight; and he was never so much in his element as when laboriously engaged in his beloved work. To do the will of his heavenly Father was the happy employment of his life. While most of the clergy aspired after high promotion, with additional worldly wealth and little work, it was Mr. Cartwright's generous concern to devote his time, talents, and learning to promote the kingdom of Christ and the salvation of souls. He was a man of ardent Christian philanthropy; and his practice through life portrayed the hallowed and honourable disposition of ardent piety.

The author of his life, who has treated his memory with great impartiality, furnishes this high character of him: He usually kept no more money in his purse than might serve for charitable purposes, being very bountiful to poor scholars; and he regularly distributed money every week amongst the poor of Warwick, in addition to what he gave to the prisoners, and on other occasions, at home and abroad. His charity never failed. He was ever ready to supply the wants of the poor and afflicted, adapting the streams of his benevolence to the circumstances of the necessitous. He never troubled himself with his household affairs, but committed them to the prudential management of Mrs. Cartwright. He was always careful in regulating the affairs of the hospital, and in promoting the comfort and welfare of the poor brethren. Many eminent continental divines sought his advice on the best method of directing young men in their studies, and in regulating the difficult affairs of their churches; and his counsel was affectionately appreciated in the weightiest matters. He was indefatigably laborious, esteeming it his highest happiness to do the will of God. He was fearless and unconpromising in the refutation of error, but the faithful and decided advocate of truth and righteousness; and, for his celebrity as a scholar, a Christian, and a philanthropist, he was endeared to all who knew him. He continued in assiduous

* Clark, p. 19.

application to study even to old age, and usually rose at three or four o'clock in the morning, summer and winter; while, on account of bodily infirmities, he was forced to study on his knees! He was of a humble, meek, and quiet spirit; and he could not endure to hear anything spoken in his own commendation, or any titles given him which in the least savoured of ambition. He did not affect popularity, but avoided it as much as possible. With these low and humble views of himself, it is added, "That he could not endure to hear even his adversaries reproached; and, if any person spoke disrespectfully of them in his presence, he would sharply reprove them, saying, 'It is a Christian's duty to pray for his enemies, and not reproach them.'"*

From these interesting features in Mr. Cartwright's history, the reader will perceive with what degree of truth one writer affirms that he was remarkably fond of "honourable and lordly titles," and another that he was "highly conceited of his own talents and learning!"† When authors depreciate the memory of distinguished men, because they did not espouse their opinions, they betray a bigotry which is despicable to every generous mind: they ought to be content with relating *facts*, and not disturb the repose of the dead by degrading and untrue imputations. Mr. Cartwright's highest ambition was to debase himself, and to advance the glory and kingdom of Jesus Christ. To the honour of his character, and the shame of his revilers, it was the unceasing joy and rejoicing of his heart to hear of the prosperity of the church of God, at home or abroad, for which he devoutly and constantly prayed; but, hearing evil tidings, like Nehemiah, he "sate down and mourned, and fasted and prayed before the God of heaven." His enemies, it would seem, were very far from being burdened with these qualifications, which might have some influence in stimulating them to reproach his character and degrade his memory! Mr. Cartwright did not measure his religion by political maxims, nor by a blind attachment to a party, nor confine his best wishes within the narrow boundary of a dominant sect; but, being founded on the basis of the gospel, they flowed from the generous effusions of a pious heart. Those who held in-

* Harleian MSS. vol. 6037, art. 3; Clark, p. 21.

† Walton's Hooker, p. 84; Strype, vol. ii. p. 1.

tercourse with him clearly perceived that nothing so powerfully affected his mind as the prosperous or adverse state of Christian churches. He cherished a spirit of unceasing devotedness to God in prayer; and, in the early part of life, he used frequently to rise from his bed in the night for the purpose of private devotion. His intense study, laborious preaching, and ardent piety were inseparably connected; and the Lord made him eminently useful in the conversion of souls, the confirmation of believers, and the terror and restraint of profane sinners.*

Mr. Cartwright excelled as an acute disputant and an admired preacher; and his name was honourably mentioned by the learned continental divines.† He was intimately acquainted with persons celebrated for piety and literature in foreign countries, with whom he lived on terms of generous friendship and held familiar correspondence to the end of his days. The celebrated Beza made honourable mention of him in letters to the learned Walter Travers; and, writing to another distinguished friend in England, he said, "Here is now with us your countryman, Thomas Cartwright, than whom, I think, the sun doth not see a more learned man."‡ Mr. Cartwright, when an exile of Christ, spent some time with the scholars and divines in the university of Leyden, where he was treated with the greatest courtesy and cordiality by the learned Junius and Trelcatius; and the celebrated Polyander gave this character of him, "If any one can be ranked with Calvin, Beza, Mercer, and Junius, it is Thomas Cartwright."§ Fuller denominates him most pious and strict in his conversation, a pure Latinist, an excellent Grecian, an exact Hebrean, and, in short, a most excellent scholar.‖

His high literary attainments were sanctified by humble and ardent piety. His heart was incessantly engaged in promoting the cause of Christ; and his deportment was uniformly pious and exemplary. He was immoveable in the duties he owed to God and man, being ever ready to perform acts of kindness for his brethren. With assiduity and steadfastness, he minded his Master's business, in full assurance of a gracious reward. He lived above the world, and, in solitude, enjoyed holy communion

* Clark, p. 21. † Leigh on Learning, p. 155; Fuller, b. ix. p. 136.
‡ Clark, p. 18. § Cartwright on Prov. Ded. ‖ Fuller, b. x. p. 3.

with God. His life was a practical comment on what he preached; and his faith and patience were tried by long and heavy affliction, which he bore with amiable submission to the will of God. In addition to affliction and persecution, when his name and his principles were blotted by detraction, he returned not evil for evil, but loved his enemies, overcoming evil with good. His industry never failed; and he discovered untiring solicitude to preach the gospel, though his labours were frequently interrupted. What God required, not what men imposed, he esteemed the rule of duty. The promise of reward, or the threat of punishment, had no influence on his calculations. He could not subscribe what he was unable to believe, nor promise to obey where he questioned the right to command. His principles, derived from inspired truth, were so matured and fixed that no power on earth could move them. He possessed a keen and powerful intellect, clearly distinguishing between truth and error, and was unmoved in his obedience to God. He revered Divine authority, the knowledge and love of which, accompanied by faith in Jesus Christ, carried him onward in the way to heaven. He died cherishing holy triumph in the Redeemer, and in joyful assurance of future glory. By his death, the Christian church lost one of its brightest ornaments, and ecclesiastical reform one of its ablest advocates.

Mr. Cartwright has been already noticed as an *author*, particularly in disputation with Dr. Whitgift, in refutation of the Rhemish translation, against the separation of the Brownists, and in exposure of Dr. Sutcliffe's aspersions; but, in all these productions, he appeared principally in the character of a controvertist. The reader must be reminded that he wrote several valuable works, and of great extent, on *practical* subjects; it will therefore be necessary, in the concluding chapter, to take some notice of him as a writer on practical divinity. These publications were all posthumous: but, previous to his death, the venerable author committed his manuscripts to safe custody, intrusting them to the care and inspection of his two friends, Mr. John Dod and Mr. Arthur Hildersham, with liberty to publish whatever they might consider useful to the public; and they undoubtedly committed most of these publications to the press.*

* Clark, p. 120.

Mr. Cartwright was author of a small publication, entitled, "A Catechisme," 1611; but this we have never seen. In his name was published "A Commentary upon the Epistle to the Colossians," quar. 1612; but his friends expressed deep lamentation that some of his writings, among which this on the Colossians, were, after his death, published in his name, with numerous and very glaring defects, in which he sustained very much wrong. This work, it is added, was "nothing else but a bundle of raw and imperfect notes, taken by some unlearned hearer, never perused or so much as seen by the author, wherein there is scarcely any good coherence of matter, or any perfect periods or sentences handsomely put together or suitably depending one upon another."*

He was author of the work now referred to, entitled, "A Treatise of the Christian Religion, or the whole Bodie and Substance of Divinitie," quar. 1616. This was the second edition, improved, which we learn from the address "to the Christian reader," by W. B., probably his friend William Bradshaw. He observes that this "Treatise" was the object of high expectation and strong desire, as that which would be of general utility to all classes of people. The author was known to make much account of this work; and, if God had prolonged his days to have perfected it according to his wishes, would have given additional satisfaction to the judicious reader. The author of this address then minutely describes the improvements adopted in this second edition, and earnestly entreats the reader to receive no publication as Mr. Cartwright's but those approved and published by his friends, to whom, by his last will and testament, he committed the perusal and examination of his writings.

This work contains three hundred and seventy-eight pages, arranged in fifty-seven chapters; and the head of each chapter states the subject it contains, which is briefly analysed, and followed by an appropriate portion of Scripture, which is amply discussed by question and answer, so as to explain and establish the leading truths in the word of God. The work, as stated in the title, contains a body of divinity, in which the author commences with a clear and explicit statement of the doctrines of Christianity, exhibiting the soundness of his views on Calvinistic principles. He then furnishes a minute explanation, and a direct application,

* Cartwright's Treatise, Pref.

of the Ten Commandments, which is followed by a particular account of the ordinances appointed by Jesus Christ; and the whole is accompanied by the enforcement of practical religion, comprehending the duties we owe both to God and man. The work is very scarce.

Mr. Cartwright was author of Commentaries on different portions of the sacred Scriptures, exhibiting uncommon assiduity and erudition. It is difficult to ascertain the exact order in which these publications came from the press; but they were all posthumous, and are enumerated with a degree of accuracy which is the result of patient investigation. To enable the reader to appreciate the value of these Commentaries, with the author's untiring industry and distinguished learning, we have not to consult the aspersions of unlearned critics, nor yet the partial statements of self-interested historians, but to recite those documents which furnish ample and unexceptionable details of the author and the productions of his pen.

The first publication is entitled, "Metaphrasis et Homiliæ in Librum Solomonis qui inscribitur Ecclesiastes," quar. 1604; that is, "An exact Translation and Homilies on the Book of Solomon called Ecclesiastes." This work, which the author prepared for publication only a few months before his death, passed through several editions, and was printed at Amsterdam in 1632, and in 1647.* The author's dedication "to James most noble and august King of England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland," was written immediately on his Majesty's accession to the English crown, and in which he thus addressed his Majesty:—

"You, most noble king, rule over Britain with a pure and bloodless sceptre, otherwise you might have had your garments rolled in blood, which might have produced conflagaration; but which has been entirely prevented by the incomparable preaching of the gospel, and your kindness especially, who peculiarly delight in the peace and innocence of your citizens: so would it have rendered you sad and mournful, if you had beheld the slaughter and burning of your subjects. We would express our gratitude to God to the remotest posterity, who has turned our pains into serenity, our darkness into light, our storms and whirlpools into placid tranquillity; whose bounty towards us we all feel, but I more especially,

* Watt's Bib. Brit. vol. i. p. 198.

whom God has made a minister, by the unexpected and unhoped-for enjoyment both of peace and righteousness. To the ordinary duty of a citizen and a subject, I have added that which has peculiarly bound me to yourself, which most immediately concerns me, that you invited me to the professorship of divinity in one of your universities twenty years ago, to which the fame of your virtue (which then began to shine forth, though now it hath become more famous, and hath diffused its rays far and wide,) had most particularly attracted me, if I had not been detained by pastoral duty at Antwerp. So rare and incomparable was your humility, that, however elevated on a throne, yet you deigned to cast your eyes upon those confined in prison, and, however occupied in the affairs of your government, have deigned to address me and Udall by letter in our confinement, when we were detained for our endeavour to promote a purer discipline in the church.

"I was therefore desirous, O most observant king, that my Commentaries should be sanctioned by your name, that I might remain safe and secure from the calumnies of the wicked, as one of those who are studious of truth. May the Lord Jesus Christ preserve your Majesty, raised to this extensive kingdom, to the incredible joy of all your pious subjects, and endow you with all the heavenly gifts of his Holy Spirit, that you may preserve, increase, and adorn it, and that the church and state may be delivered from all the machinations of priests, particularly the Jesuits, and long continue in safety. Your Majesty's most devoted, THOMAS CARTWRIGHT."

In the preface to this work, the author, stating his sentiments of the book on which he comments, gives this account of his performance: "What is scattered in many books of the sacred writings is closely treated and clearly defined in the Ecclesiastes. The prophet has clearly represented true and absolute felicity to be placed in piety towards God and righteousness towards men, obviously rejecting and refuting the opinions of false pretenders. This work, therefore, the Holy Spirit, the scribes, and the wisest men that ever existed or shall exist, ought to be acknowledged as having treated upon this argument in the most profitable manner. The study of it ought not to be laid aside, because some have dreamed that it appears to have some resemblance to the opinions of Epicurus and Atheists. So far, indeed, is it from belonging to the school of

Epicurus, and those who place the chief good in pleasure, that, on the contrary, it represents a life of pleasure as madness and folly. It proposes the fear of God, the keeping of his commandments, and the whole book exclaims against vanity, which is completely opposed to the doctrines of atheism. But I wish you would learn the value of the book from Solomon himself rather than from my observations." In the Homilies, he observed that he had treated of the whole book as a paraphrase, partly that the sense and economy of the prophet might be better understood, and partly that those who had not leisure to read the whole book might obtain what they sought with less difficulty. He then concludes by recommending the kind reader to bring a mind loving sincerity and truth, as he had done in preparing the work.

Mr. Cartwright was author of a work entitled, "Commentarii Succincti et Dilucidi in Proverbia Solomonis," quar. 1617, and quar. 1638: "Succinct and Plain Commentaries on the Proverbs of Solomon." This work was printed at Leyden by the excellent Mr. William Brewster,* and was dedicated by John Polyander, a celebrated professor in the university of Leyden, "to the candidates in divinity." His dedication is dated January 10th of the year first mentioned; and, having shown the importance of a true knowledge of the sacred volume, he furnishes this high commendation of the venerable author and the production of his pen:—

"If any one can be ranked with Calvin, Beza, Mercer, and Junius, it is Thomas Cartwright, an Englishman of the county of Warwick, formerly professor of divinity in the university of Cambridge, who, endowed by the Almighty with the gift of interpreting the sacred writings, has given excellent proofs of it to his own countrymen, both in English and Latin, a distinguished part of which I now offer to you as a proof of my kindness towards you, O most excellent youths! contained in his Commentaries on the Proverbs of Solomon, in which, by admirable skill, he exhibits the true method of rightly explaining the word of God, and aptly applying it to the use of mankind; by which method of instruction, it might be wished that all ecclesiastics, who are engaged in the instruction of youth, should be guided in their discourses to the people.

* Young's Chronicles, p. 466.

"In the first place, together with an analysis of the chapters and verses, he accurately expounds the words and the familiar manner of speaking adopted by the Holy Ghost, wherever any obscurity or ambiguity occurs. Secondly, he places the sense and scope of the author in all places before the eyes of the reader. Thirdly, he diligently discloses, whenever an occasion is afforded him, those dubious points which, in what has been proposed, sometimes occur. Fourthly, he treats in exquisite order those dogmatic opinions, both exhortative and consolatory, which may be rightly collected from the context.

"This Cartwright had been invited by certain English merchants at Middleburg and Antwerp to the pastoral office in those places, and gave them entire satisfaction. Also in this university, he spent some time with our divines, and was received with the utmost respect by the most excellent Junius and Trelcatius. I now call upon you, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that you would apply yourselves to those tranquil studies for the benefit of posterity, and sow the good seed in the fertile field of the Proverbs, and carefully follow that rule of reverence towards God and righteousness towards men which, after Solomon, Cartwright has carefully proposed to your attention."

Another Latin production of our author is entitled, "Commentaria Practica in totam Historiam Evangelicam, ex quatuor Evangelistis harmonicè concinnatam," 1630: "A Practical Commentary on the whole Gospel History harmoniously digested from the Four Evangelists." This work is in three books, forming one thick quarto volume, containing upwards of fourteen hundred pages, to which are prefixed two dedications and a preface, the writers of which were probably Dod and Hildersham; and, though there is no place nor printer's name on the title, it was no doubt printed abroad.

The former dedication is addressed "To the most celebrated and ancient Society of Merchants, Adventurers in England, particularly to Thomas Moulson, governor, citizen, and alderman of London, to Edward Bennet, of the college of Hamburgh, and Edward Misselden, of the college of Delph, stewards, assistants, and all and several of that body corporate." In this dedication, the editors said, "Among your fellow-labourers we congratulate the

reverend Cartwright, your late faithful and religious pastor at Antwerp, whose learned and celebrated discourses, as your Society happily enjoyed them, so we were unwilling that they should perish or receive any other patronage. With grateful minds lay up this work among your treasures; and, with St. Paul, you will not be ashamed of the gospel of Christ, which is the power of God to every one that believeth; so shall you find that godliness with contentment is great gain."

The latter dedication is directed "To the most illustrious Robert Earl of Warwick, and William Viscount Say and Sele;" in which the editors observe, "The author is so well known and beloved among the English, a man of excellent parts and admirable erudition; of his Commentaries we need not say any thing in bringing them forth, as may be said of the Iliad of Homer, that monuments both of ancient and modern literature occur in them. Let the studious place them in their libraries, and we are persuaded that preachers will avail themselves of their practical information; and the pious reader will find sufficient to delight and profit him." They then offer affectionate advice to the two worthy nobles, urging them to press forwards in the profession and propagation of undefiled religion, since scepticism and irreligion were so prevalent among the "grandees" of our country; adding, "Be tenacious of the design and stability of your minds among the fluctuating opinions of mankind. Suffer not Christ to be contemned, nor the gospel to be despised, in your houses. Let others pursue their own pleasures, but may Christ be to you preciousness itself, the promises, piety, and holiness your aim, and eternal life your portion and reward."

The writer of the preface observes, "We have just cause to glorify God for enduing Mr. Cartwright with such excellent gifts; that while he has paid attention to many other things, yet to this especially, and to translate his discourses on the Harmony of the Gospel in English into Latin. It appears from these notes, designed by him for the press, that he had also prepared a logical analysis and paraphrase throughout to be joined with them, though it doth not appear in the edition which hath been published about three years, and is in the hands of every student."

An elegant and improved edition of this work was afterwards

published at Amsterdam, entitled, "Harmonia Evangelica, Commentario Analytico, Metaphrastico, Practico, Illustrata," quar. 1647: "The Evangelical Harmony illustrated by an Analytical, Metaphrastic, and Practical Commentary." The dedication is addressed "to the most learned and celebrated Dr. Adrian Heerebord, Professor of Natural and Moral Philosophy, and Vice-President of the University of Leyden," by whose influence and encouragement it was re-published, in which the writer adds, "I am well aware how highly you esteemed the author for his singular genius, correct judgment, and remarkable dexterity in unfolding, explaining, and applying the sense of the Scripture."

In the preface to this improved edition, the nature and properties of the work, with the corrections and improvements, are clearly and fully stated:—

"You have here the evangelical harmony of the most learned and eminent divine, Thomas Cartwright, illustrated by an Analytical, Metaphrastic, and Practical Commentary, which has hitherto not been done. The author has connected this together from all the evangelists, having a due regard to accuracy of time; and, things supplying in one which were wanting in others, he has comprehended the history of Christ in one continued series of events. He deduces brief remarks from the evangelists, agreeable to the rules of logic, free, however, from its intricacies, being more pure and concise, which medium, in the opinion of the learned, is best calculated to unfold the meaning of Scripture, which could not be accomplished without an accurate analysis; but, in this, our Cartwright has wonderfully displayed his skill. He has subjoined to this analysis a paraphrase or metaphrase, in which he unfolds in one copiously what he has advanced in the analysis and unmixed with the terms of art, thereby exhibiting the genuine sense investigated and discovered by the labour of learned logicians in analysis. Thence follow, in the last place, a praxis where he accommodates the meaning of evangelical doctrine, discovered in the analysis reduced to the paraphrase, and applies them to the true use of doctrine, reproof, and instruction in righteousness, in which our author so excels that he may be considered second to no one.

"You will, indeed, seek for no excellences in a commentator and interpreter of Scripture which you will not find in Cartwright:

perspicuous in explaining, solid in teaching, victorious in refuting, severe in reprehending, gentle in exhorting, truly divine in consoling, in every thing concise and plain, by which virtues I mean brevity and simplicity, which you will see here shine forth without any diminution; so that neither conciseness nor simplicity will obscure his perspicuity, nor his simplicity the majesty of his subject. You will not here find a verbosity of expression, without weight and importance in the matter, each sentence containing a reason which may confirm the reader and hearer in the study of truth and piety: and although the author treats upon many doctrines briefly, yet you will find nothing wanting to a full investigation; he propounds nothing jejune and dry, but the head of arguments, which he will either point out to you or you may easily discern yourself. He lays before you brief and accurate summaries of the texts. He generally uses comparative and various arguments to move the minds of men in the most efficacious manner. His style is adapted to his matter, which consists not in the words which man's wisdom teaches, but in the demonstration of the Spirit. To sum up all in one word, you will find nothing here which doth not profit the church of God." The preface, having adverted to the defects of the former impression, concludes by stating the superior improvements and advantages of this edition.

The character here furnished of Mr. Cartwright and his learned writings is not the fruit of prolific ingenuity or imaginative colouring, intended by a partial biographer to produce an erroneous impression on the mind of the reader. It is a detail of remarkable facts, derived from various unexceptionable sources, and presents to the reader the premeditated sentiments of men of profound literature and piety, remote from prejudice and partiality. These interesting testimonials furnish a prominent and comprehensive portraiture of the piety, erudition, and labours of Mr. Cartwright as a commentator of Scripture and a writer on *practical* religion. This, when considered in connexion with his polemical writings, and his sufferings for Christ, will render his name to be remembered by all persons of enlightened and liberal minds, and cause his memory to be honoured and revered by a discerning posterity. Mr. Baxter placed Mr. Cartwright's polemical writings at the head of the principal works against diocesan prelacy and ecclesiastical

conformity, and those on practical religion among the most learned commentators of Scripture.* In addition to the articles enumerated, Mr. Cartwright was the author of various other works, and the following is a list of those which are ascribed to him:—

Second Admonition, with an Humble Petition to both Houses of Parliament, *quarto*, 1572.

A Replye to an Answere made by M. Doctor Whitgift, *quarto*, 1573.

The Second Replie against Maister Doctor Whitgifte's Second Answer, *quarto*, 1575 and 1577.

An Answere vnto a Letter of Master Harrisons, *quarto*, but no date.

A Brief Apologie against Sutcliffe, *quarto*, 1596.

Answere to the Preface of the Rhemish Testament, *duo*. 1602.

Metaphrasis et Homiliæ in librum Solomonis qui inscribitur Ecclesiastes, *quarto*, 1604.

A Catechisme, 1611.

A Commentary upon the Epistle to the Colossians, *quarto*, 1612.

A Body of Divinity, *quarto*, 1616.

Commentarii Succincti et Dilucidi in Proverbia Solomonis, *quarto*, 1617.

A Confutation of the Rhemist Translation, *folio*, 1618.

The Pope's deadly Wound against the Papists, *quarto*, 1621.

Commentaria Practica in totam Historiam Evangelicam, *quarto*, 1630.

A Directory for Church Government, *quarto*, 1644.

It is hoped that the memorials here presented to the public furnish a clear insight into the character and principles of our puritan Reformer, exhibiting his defects as well as his excellences, and the aspersions cast upon him by his enemies, accompanied with copious strictures on his controversial writings, followed by a characteristic view of his works on practical theology. All the prominent features of the portrait are exhibited to the view of the reader; his superior piety, powerful intellect, and distinguished learning; his patriotism, nonconformity, and laborious solicitude to obtain ecclesiastical reform; his unimpeachable fidelity to conscience, untarnished loyalty to the queen, and inflexible adherence

* Baxter's Directory, p. 926, 928.

to the truth of God. The bold and unflinching stand which he made against spiritual encroachment and ecclesiastical intolerance, and in favour of greater purity and freedom, which, though scorned and rejected by opponents, made a powerful impression on all liberal minds, the fruits and benefits of which remain to this day. By his arduous struggles and learned defences, he laid the foundation of a noble superstructure, which, when completed, will secure that birthright which is the Creator's gift to every living man.

That the subject of this memoir was a great sufferer in the cause he espoused will not be questioned; but whether the inflictions he sustained betrayed the flagrant injustice and inhumanity of his opponents, and whether his sufferings stand as a monument of reproach to the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and to the bishops by whom they were promoted, an enlightened and unbiassed public will judge. The apologists of intolerance may depreciate his fame, scorn his principles, and condemn his practice, all of which may be expected from the enemies of piety and Christianity; but those who possess the power of sober reflection, who reverence the truth of God, and who claim the birthright of man, making allowance for human frailties, will admire his character and revere his memory. His eminent abilities, profound erudition, unflinching constancy, indefatigable labours, untiring zeal, admired preaching, distinguished benevolence, superior holiness, and his sufferings for Christ and a good conscience, formed an assemblage of excellences too splendid to be forgotten. In the history of Mr. Cartwright, we behold the pious and uncompromising fortitude with which he sustained accumulated wrong rather than barter his freedom and betray his conscience, showing throughout the ascendancy of his principles, the steadfastness of his faith, the disinterestedness of his purpose, the soundness of his piety, the humility of his spirit, and the devout obedience to his heavenly Father's will. "Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like-minded one towards another according to Christ Jesus: that ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

It remains, in conclusion, to unfold some of those principles which the narrative has suggested. The reader will have per-

ceived that an attempt has been made to present unimpeachable facts as the basis on which the memoir is founded, and to make those deductions which are legitimately sustained by faithful records and the word of God. It will not then be improper to state the nature of Christian churches, with their distinction from other institutions. The Lord Jesus having said, "My kingdom is not of this world," may awaken the inquiry, How is it not of this world? It has been observed that, if Herod and Pontius Pilot had distinguished kingdoms, their suspicions would have vanished. Men in power have their secular kingdoms, and there is also a *spiritual* kingdom; but neither trenches upon the other. Christ's kingdom is spiritual—theirs is secular. His laws are Divine—theirs are civil. His reign is eternal—theirs is temporal. The glory of his kingdom is "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost"—theirs is worldly wealth and magnificence. His government is over conscience—theirs is over men's estates. He punishes offenders with endless perdition—they with temporal infliction. From these important facts, the reader will perceive the vast difference between churches founded on human legislation and churches founded on the apostolic model, whose constitution and offices, whose doctrine and worship, whose duties and immunities were all furnished by Divine inspiration. He will, moreover, perceive similar difference between the governments of the world and the government of the churches of Christ. Those are based on the authority of men—this on the authority of Jesus Christ. Those are political arrangements, and are ever changing—this is a Divine appointment, and is unalterable. Those are conducted by the exercise of power—this by the persuasion of truth. Those relate to men's estates—this to their souls. Those to their concerns with men—this to their concerns with God. Those to this world—this to the world to come. The churches must, therefore, be free that they may be spiritual, and must be spiritual that they may be free. Their organization and government cannot be derived from philosophical researches, nor from the hierarchy of apostate Rome, nor yet from the legislation of statesmen; but only from a direct appeal to the instructions of the New Testament, in which, with unerring wisdom, is revealed their origin and government, their glory and strength.

The word of God provides all the spiritual jurisdiction pertaining to Christian churches; and no devise of man can be at all appropriate to their spiritual government. The Lord Jesus, "upholding all things by the word of his power," clearly understood his own cause, by what laws it was to be governed, and by what agency to be promoted, rejecting all coercive interference as inappropriate and unwarrantable. It will scarcely be doubted that the Lord Jesus requires all the points of church discipline to be administered under the influence of piety, and in obedience to his holy will; but how can this important duty be expected from men collected by external force? He who claimeth rightful sovereignty in all ecclesiastical affairs has honoured his churches by making them the repositories and executors of his will, requiring them, individually and collectively, to carry into full operation whatsoever he has prescribed.

That the Lord Jesus is the only lawgiver in his churches demands the most careful and solemn consideration; and it will be found upon inquiry that, if he had not revealed every peculiarity belonging to them, no being in existence could have discovered it or have ascertained the amount of man's responsibility to God. Since all His requirements are matters of pure revelation, it necessarily follows that no addition or deduction can be legitimately made without a new revelation from heaven; yet all classes of men, from the highest to the lowest, are under indispensable obligation to obey him, and an amendment of his requirements seems impossible. Where then is the evidence that men in power are invested with authority to enforce religion by compulsory enactments? Where is the document, with the seal of heaven affixed, conveying to them this power? What beings on earth can legislate on these subjects without first depreciating, then usurping, the authority of Jesus Christ? And, how can any creature be obeyed in such matters without trenching on his supremacy, as well as on man's responsibility? Does not the Lord Jesus possess authority both to govern his churches and to prescribe their religion? Is it not then impossible for any creature to assume the power of doing the one or the other, without trespassing on his prerogative? Those who claim this power betray an unwarrantable purpose, and pursue a course replete with danger both to

themselves and others. And we learn, from unexceptionable records, that this assumption of power has proved the greatest plague that ever visited Christian churches! It then behoves men in high stations to exercise minute and impartial inquiry, with a view to correct their mistakes, lest they tamper with the gospel, tarnish its glory, diminish its power, and subvert its influence, recollecting that all offenders must perish rather than the Lord Jesus will surrender any portion of his authority to man.

An eminent author observes, "That religious liberty is a liberty to choose our own religion, to worship God according to our own conscience, according to the light we have. Every man living, as man, has a right to this as he is a rational creature. The Creator gave him this right when he endowed him with understanding. And every man must judge for himself, because every man must give an account of himself to God. Consequently this is an indefeasible right: it is inseparable from humanity. And God did never give authority to any man, or number of men, to deprive any child of man thereof, under any colour or pretence whatever! What an amazing thing is it, then, that the governing part of almost every nation under heaven should have taken upon them, in all ages, to rob all under their power of this liberty! yea, to force rational creatures into their way."*

These enlightened and dignified sentiments would do honour to the head and heart of any man. This liberty is the gift of the Creator; and our author adds that "it is that liberty, properly so called, which every wise and good man desires." Though the choice of religion is said to be "an indefeasible right," and "inseparable from humanity," yet it is well known that multitudes of our countrymen are defrauded of this right, especially in small towns and rural districts, where those are found who, not having learned the first principle of Christianity, endeavour to prevent the people choosing their religion, and rob them of the Creator's gift in concerns of eternal moment! But no sound protestant will envy the character of men who betray hostility against the highest interest of man.† The Bishop of London declared before a committee

* Wesley's Works, vol. xv. p. 281.

† This statement is sufficiently attested by facts. The practice of bribery and intimidation is, in rural districts, carried to a most deplorable extent. The distribution of public

of the House of Commons "that the positive enforcement of religious duties by penalties was a mistake." Admitting his lordship's principle to be correct, the Anglican church has always been guilty of this mistake, since its ecclesiastical canons, its parliamentary enactments, and the proceedings of its spiritual courts have constantly enforced religious duties by heavy penalties! Let this mistake be corrected, and all will at once be set right: coercion in religion will cease, Christianity will be unfettered, the gospel will have free course, and all classes will possess the birthright of man.

By the rapid strides of error, the papal authorities, it is well known, are flushed with hope that England will soon throw herself into the bosom of the Romish church. And it is admitted that, so long as religion remains unemancipated from existing trammels, freedom of conscience is only a chartered name, and catholics will keep alive these expectations; but when unfettered religious freedom shall become the fixed national principle, the papal authorities will be disappointed, the gospel will have unrestricted operation, its unencumbered heavenly benefits will spread in all directions, while peace and happiness, truth and love will pervade all ranks of society. The diffusion of the gospel is the appointed instrument of achieving these signal conquests; so, when this powerful agency shall obtain impartial and unrestricted operation throughout the empire, the Christian forces will be augmented and consolidated, the blessings of heaven will descend in all their rich effusions, and the happy achievement will bring "peace on earth, and good will to men."

Those who employ unhallowed weapons to defeat the success of the gospel may rest assured their sin will find them out. It would seem unnatural for men to love ecclesiastical manacles and decline personal inquiry, to prefer slavery and corruption to freedom and truth, to keep themselves in darkness and under prostration of

charities, the employment of honest industry, the patronage of trade, the occupation of farms, the possession of homes, and other supposed favours, are made dependent on certain ecclesiastical observances! These are the common occurrences of the country; and it is well known that men of wealth and rank, of influence and priestly authority, are overtaken with this ecclesiastical insanity! These debasements of Christianity, and obstructions to its progress, are too often very prominently displayed, showing the lamentable degradation which men bring upon themselves and endeavour to bring upon others!

soul; but all persons appear to do this who refuse the exercise of private judgment, depreciate their responsibility to God, or make themselves the slaves of existing abuses. Penal codes in religion cripple freedom of thought and of conscience, and, in like proportion, disgrace Christianity and trespass on the authority of its Founder. How exalted soever men may be raised, they cannot by any possibility exonerate Christians from their allegiance to Christ and his truth; but it is a duty required of all to maintain this allegiance unalterable, by whomsoever it may be assailed.

It ought, moreover, to be distinctly understood that ecclesiastical power is a prerogative which belongs to God, and not to man; nor can it with safety be intrusted to man's discretion. Frail mortals, merely from being born in certain ranks of society, have unhappily assumed this power; but they must have forgotten that they had not abilities to wield so mighty a weapon, the proof of which arose from the fact that, while God furnished them with the requisite instructions to execute his holy will, they were merely his agents or executors, under solemn and fearful responsibility. In conducting ecclesiastical power to a favourable issue, He alone, who was "the head of all principality and power," had sufficient ability to carry out its holy administration. Men in every age who have arrogated this power have rendered themselves powerless, except in doing mischief, as demonstrated from the page of history.

The advocates of religious freedom occupy the vantage ground of God's most holy word; and, since they have no sinister ends to accomplish, but aim only at securing the Creator's gift to every living man, the people feel its resistless power, and appreciate its beneficial influence on their judgments and consciences. Religious principle, as its history proves, is the mightiest principle in existence, and, when placed under the heaviest pressure, it upheaves and overcomes every obstruction. Religion has been long working itself out from earthly shackles, and, though powerful obstruction still impedes its progress, yet no one can doubt its eventual deliverance. When the light of the gospel shall be more extensively diffused, sober reflection will follow, personal inquiry will increase, prejudice will give way, errors will subside, the truth of Christ will triumph, and Christians, with one accord, will glorify God. The present state of religious freedom exhibits signal improvement com-

pared with by-gone times. That improvement, which may sometimes appear slow, is in constant progress; and, since it is the cause of God and truth, the power of mortals may as soon stop the sun in his course as prevent its future triumphs in harmony with the triumphs of Christianity.

The following facts will probably not be questioned, except by those who are far on the road to Rome: That God has prescribed the service required of his creatures; that this service is perfect and not improvable by man; and that every man possesses the indubitable right of choosing and observing this service. But the admission of these simple facts, as the reader will perceive, demonstrates the injustice of coercion from man. Moreover, if it be the duty of any man to receive and obey the gospel, it must be the duty of all to respect his conduct, and also to obey, in like manner, whatsoever legislators may determine to the contrary. Though the ecclesiastical system is now milder than in the days of Queen Elizabeth, owing principally to the improved tone of public feeling in favour of religious freedom, yet the Established Church is still governed by the civil power, which, by its multiplied enactments, claims entire legislation and sovereign control.* This was the great mistake adopted at the Reformation, when protestant supremacy was substituted for popish infallibility; but, when those in power understand the spiritual legislation revealed in the gospel, when they devoutly acknowledge its Divine authority, and when their minds are brought under its elevating influence, they will feel the power of its moral requirements, enjoy the benefit of its spiritual melioration, and adopt an improved system of legislation, allowing Jesus Christ to be King in his own kingdom.

The obvious fact is that no creature on earth could have discovered how God was to be worshipped, if he had not made known his will to man; and it is an unspeakable mercy that he has re-

* It may not be improper to record one instance of its enactments, showing the extent of ecclesiastical legislation. The parliament of 1842 introduced the "Incumbents' Leases" bill, "Ecclesiastical Incorporations" bill, "Ecclesiastical Residence" bill, "Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Suspension" bill, "East India Bishops" bill, and the "West India Clergy" bill; and, during that session, no less than *fifteen* acts were passed in behalf of the Established Church, all of which are particularly noticed in the British Magazine of that year. Was the fact then fully ascertained by the parliament in 1842 that the Established Church stood in need of reformation?

vealed the whole of his requirements, so that neither additions nor deductions can be admitted; it is also equally obvious that no religious worship can be acceptable to God but that which He has described in his holy word. The Author of religion has unalterably fixed and prescribed the precise extent of his requirements and the specific method in which our service must be presented to Him; therefore, it seems extremely perilous for any body of men forcibly to intermix human devices with the religion of Jesus Christ. Human legislation in this cause seems absolutely unwarrantable. The holy Scriptures contain the laws of religion, and demonstrate that religion is a personal concern exclusively between man and his Maker. But when those in power interfere in such matters, and arrange the affairs of religion by the principle of expediency, they discard the great law of obligation under which God has placed them, and involve themselves in a labyrinth of dangerous errors; they degrade Christianity, and mislead the people; and, instead of observing the Saviour's holy administration, they expose themselves to a fearful retribution!

Christianity was conveyed to this country, not by order of the government, but by the sovereign appointment of its Founder; so the success of its agency, not being a government concern, is secured by that influence which no power on earth can control. All historians agree that the Christian religion, by a gracious providence, achieved signal triumphs during the first three centuries, even under the extreme pressure of persecution from earthly governments; will it then be said that its power is diminished, and that God now stands in need of government assistance to enforce His instructions? On the contrary, if Christianity be left to its own powerful agency, as when first promulgated, no intelligent protestant will doubt its efficiency in conferring heavenly benefits. Let conscience be liberated from the dictation of mortals, and allow the Lord Jesus, who is Lord of conscience, to have exclusive dominion over it; then will be diffused a principle which will greatly contribute to the honour of God and the happiness of man. And it must be borne in mind that Jesus Christ disowns all legislation in religion, except that which is derived from himself: he claims this high honour. Will the fact, then, be questioned that a man's religion constitutes an important part of his freehold, to

which God has given him a legal and secure title? Or, can it be doubted that every man has an equal right to his religion, as to the light of the sun, or to the air he breathes? When this principle is adopted as the fixed principle of the empire, being important and immutable truth, its operations will be signally beneficial to the churches of Christ; and all men will admire its peaceful and meliorating triumphs, except those who esteem it a luxury to disturb the religion of others.

Christianity, when unfettered, supplies those principles which adorn and elevate the character of man; expanding his intellect, refining his taste, controlling his passions, purifying his affections, governing his conscience, regulating his practice, and fitting him for a blissful immortality. To secure these benefits unto men, the gospel is appointed to be promulgated in the world, and, for this purpose, its Author has furnished suitable directions: this important arrangement could not be left to the discretion of man. Christianity leans on no arm, has no partner, seeks no alliance, feels no weakness, asks no assistance; but its holy instructions, sustained by Omnipotence, are binding on every man's conscience. These honourable principles, which cannot be the subject of legitimate censure, speak for themselves, and speak in the name of the Great Supreme. To remove obstructions to the progress of Christianity, and to perfect the work of Reformation, the celebrated Wycliffe recommended that men should retrace their steps in departing from God's word, and that the church should be freed from incumbrance and mischief, whatsoever laws, whether of church or state, might stand in the way.* Princes and statesmen cannot furnish better evidence of their love to Christian churches than by promoting their unfettered independence, with their self-supplying resources; and when they shall be sufficiently enlightened, they will doubtless refuse to intermeddle any more with the great concerns between man and his Maker! They will then allow the benefits of Christianity to be diffused without restriction or incumbrance, and Christian churches to be governed by the laws of Jesus Christ. The great and good work will then be consummated, and a glorious Reformation, sustained by immutable truth, will excite unmingled gratulation in the breast of every true protestant.

* Wycliffe's Tracts, p. 63.

The people, in by-gone times, were treated not as intellectual and responsible beings, but as vassals rather than Christians and Britons. Ignorance and priestcraft demanded slavish subjection to rank and office; but those times are passed away, and the dawn of a brighter day has now commenced. It may be hoped that the time is fast approaching when Divine truth will burst forth in all its splendour, and majesty, and strength, and when the spreading gospel, attended by the smiles of God, will break down every barrier obstructing its progress, bring to naught whatsoever opposeth its beneficial influence, and obtain an illustrious triumph over men's unhallowed passions. The Lord, by this holy instrumentality, will consume the deadly errors which may then exist, break every galling yoke from the necks of his people, guide and govern the souls of those who trust in him, and secure to them the promised benefits of the sons of God. Then will our happy government rejoice to behold the people, "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, and not be entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Then it will be said, "Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim;" but all ranks of men will dwell together in harmony, and peace, and love. Then will antichristian power be overthrown, the kingdom of Christ be advanced, the word of God be obeyed, and all Christians unite to assist each other in the way to a blissful immortality! Then will the glorious period be anticipated, when "The kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever." "The Lord hasten it in his time."

INDEX.

Accusations against puritans, 341, 343; laid before the queen, 361.
Act of parliament, compelling attendance at church, 16, 17; of uniformity, the power of, 13.
Administration of Christ discarded, 29, 31; fixed and submitted to, 30, 416; extent of, 443.
Admonition published, 96; its authors Field and Wilcocks, 97; opinion of several bps., 98; occasion of a famous controversy, 100; highly esteemed and extensively circulated, 102.
Advantage of the Scriptures translated, 269—274.
Aggrandizement of the papacy, 4.
Alan, Dr., advised the Rhemish translation, 256.
Alvey, H., took the oath *ex officio*, 386; could depose nothing, *ib.*
Andrews, Dr., to confer with Cartwright, 353.
Anecdote of Queen Elizabeth dining at Lambeth, 12; of the Earl of Essex, 312.
Answer to Cartwright, 306.
Antichrist, assumption and cruelties of, 4.
Apostles, their commission and obedience, 1, 419; defence of, 30.
Apostolical churches popular and unalterable, 33; not under earthly government, *ib.*; examples to others, 440; the liberty of, 441.
——————succession, a popish claim, 206; its power censured, 417.
Archbishop, his letter noticed, 419.
——————s, their offices, courts and revenues examined, 129; whether they belong to Christian churches, 173—184.
Archdeacons unprofitable, 180.
Articles, thirty-nine, subscribed, 10.
Arundal, Abp., said the Scriptures should not be translated, 274.
Asplyn, a printer, examined, 151.
Assumption of power in religion unwarrantable, 17, 23, 26, 35, 417.
Axton, W., ordained abroad, 310.
Aylmer, Bp., imprisoned Cartwright, 223; degrading letter to the council, 224; a reformer, then a persecutor, 224—227; opinion of Queen Elizabeth, 225; wished to be released from "official turmoil," *ib.*, 226; rebuked by Lord Burghley, *ib.*; severe proceedings of, 346, 351; died rich, 455.

Bacon, A., requested Mr. Cartwright to adjust family disputes, 355.
Ballard, the papist, opinion of the dispute between Cartwright and Whitgift, 204.
Bancroft, Dr., his opposition to Cartwright, 346—351; disgusting intolerance, 352.
Barber, T., took the oath *ex officio*, 386; what he deposed, 387.
Barbone united in religious assemblies, 338.
Barrow, H., conferred with Cartwright, 306; carried out his principles, 307, 449.
Barwell, Dr., petitioned in favour of Cartwright and others, 398, 399.
Baxter, his defence of Cartwright, 430.
Bentham, Bp., a reformer, 24.
Beza, his opinion of Cartwright, 460.
Bible translated, 5, 8; the religion of protestants, 28; instrument and only authority of ecclesiastical reform, 5, 28, 446, 447.
Bill, Dr., favoured abuses, 45.
Bill in Star Chamber, 356.
Bills in parliament for greater freedom, 391.
Bilson, Dr., answered Rhemist translation, 289.
Birthright of man defended, 158.
Bishop of London, his declaration before the House of Commons, 474, 475.
Bishops, character of, 8; protested against images, 11; required to be laborious pastors, 19; denied that the queen was supreme head of the church, 21; contended for a better reformation, 24, 25; their pliability, 36; whether to be in every congregation, 190—196; not to interfere in civil affairs, 200; their supremacy exposed, 231; required more than did the apostles, 433.

Blackburn, Archdeacon, his defences of Cartwright, 108, 431.
Bonner, Bp., consistent, 92; further noticed, 401.
Book of Common-prayer censured, 142, 144; objections against, 440.
———of discipline subscribed, 241.
Bourman, —, preached at Warwick, 311; his benefices, 396.
Bradford, J., his views of the Reformation, 7, 8.
Bradshaw, W., the friend of Cartwright, 434, 462; remarkable escape of, 434, 435.
Bribery and intimidation, prevalence of, 474, 475.
Bristow, R., translator of the Rhemish Testament, 256.
Britain, dark state of, 3; dawn of its reformation, 4.
Brown, J., wrote to Cartwright, 250, 251.
———, N., severe treatment of, 144.
———, R., answer of, 306.
Browning, Dr., severe usage of, 145.
Brownism, dissuaded from, 299—303.
Brownists, controversy with, 299—307; not favoured, 388.
Buckhurst, Lord, member of the Star Chamber, 346.
Buckingham, Duke of, queries, 89.
Bulkley, Dr., answered Rhemist translation, 289.
Bullinger, his advice to Bishops Grindal and Horn, 22, 25.
Burghley, Lord, consulted Cartwright, 93, 94; rebuked Whitgift and Aylmer, 226; petitions presented to him by puritans, 293, 296, 315, 321, 325, 339, 361, 372, 404; admonitory letters to Whitgift, 324, 330; recommended lenity to her Majesty, 332; obtained correct information concerning Cartwright and his companions, 379—382; their release from prison by his efforts, 414.

Calumnies exposed, 430.
Calvin, opinion of, cited, 196.
Cambridge divines interceded for Cartwright and others, 398.
Cartwright, Thomas, birth and education, 37, 38; forced from the university, *ib.*; employment in the law, *ib.*; beheld the cruelties of Mary, 39; return to college, *ib.*, 40; disputant before the queen, *ib.*, 41; accused of being disconcerted, refuted, 43; other accusations disproved, 44, 45; took his degree, 48; chosen Margaret Professor, *ib.*; his popular lectures, *ib.*; 49; generous spirit, 51; accused to the chancellor, *ib.*; his doctrines styled novel, 52; opposed by Grindal, 54, 55; prevented completing his degrees, 56; his letter to the chancellor, *ib.*, 57; high testimonials in his favour, 58—62; chancellor recommended lenient measures, 63; his letter to Cartwright, *ib.*; suspended from his office, *ib.*; applied to the chancellor, 64; his reputation in the university, 66; convened before heads of houses, 69; his propositions, 70; deprivation, 71; his opinions sent to the queen, 72; imitated the early reformers, 73; expelled from the university, 74; his defence, 75, 78, 81; denied false imputations, 79; protected by persons of eminence, 82; various charges refuted, *ib.*, 83; defended Christ's kingdom, 84; deprived of public usefulness, 89; return from abroad, 93; consulted by Lord Burghley concerning the queen's marriage, *ib.*, 94; author of second "Admonition," 99; extracts from, *ib.*, 100; his "Replye" to Whitgift, 104; preliminary remarks, 105; leading particulars—standard of judgment, with Jewel's statement, 106—109; election of ministers, *ib.*; officers of churches, with Hooker's affirmation, 111—115; clerical habits, with Hooker's statement, 115; bishops and archbishops, with Hooker's positions, 118—120; authority of princes in matters ecclesiastical, 122; confirmation by a bp., 124; the work censured and applauded, 127, 128, 138; warrant to apprehend the author, 154—156; his brother, how treated, 159; Hicks, M., the kindness of, 160; retired into exile, 161; "Second Replie" to Whitgift, 167, 168; head of the church, with Hooker's comments, 169, 173; archbishops, with Hooker's remarks, 173, 184; election of ministers, with Hooker's affirmation, 185, 189, 190; bishops in every congregation, with King's statement, 190, 196; ecclesiastical persons in civil offices, with Hooker's notice, 196, 201; various opinions of the dispute, 201—204; Cartwright's dignified sentiments, 209, 210; insinuations against him, 215; settled at Middleburg and Antwerp, 216; invited to Guernsey to assist the churches, 217—219; his marriage, *ib.*; letter from his friends, 220, 221; King James offered him preferment, *ib.*, 457; his heavy affliction, and petitions for liberty to return, 222; return and imprisonment by Bishop Aylmer, 223; release from prison, 232; his powerful friends, 234, 235; made master of the hospital at Warwick, 235—237; renewed his public ministry, 238; meetings for reformation, 238—243; letters

addressed to him about printing a book, 250—252; pressed to answer the Rhemist translation, 259; learned divines addressed him, 260—262; forbidden to preach by Whitgift, 262—265, 290; his "Confutation" of the Rhemists, 267—288; convened before Bp. Freke, 292; returned to his charge, 293; applied to Burghley in behalf of the hospital, whose endowments were endangered, 293—295; petitioned Burghley and Hicks, 296—298; his exertions successful, *ib.*; endeavoured to persuade Mrs. Stubbs from Brownism, 299—303; his reproof of Brownists, *ib.*; answer to Harrison, 304—306; ministerial labours, 307; letter to Puckering, 308; appeared before the High-commission, 309; accusations against him, 309—313; required to take the oath *ex officio*, 314; disapproved of Martin Mar-prelate, 315—318; letter to Lord Chancellor Hatton, 318—321; committed to the Fleet, 321, 325; united with his fellow-prisoners in petitions to Lord Burghley, 321, 325, 328, 339, 361, 372, 394; his affliction, 327; subscribed a declaration, 336; letter to A. Bacon, 355; bill in Star Chamber against him and others, 350—360; interrogatories administered to them, 362—365, 383, 384; Cartwright's letter to Lady Russell, 367—371; also to Sir F. Knollys, 374, 375; petitioned the council, 375—377; lamentable state of the prisoners, 378; their defence, 388, 389; Cartwright interrogated, 390; imputations against the prisoners, 394; petitioned Whitgift, 395, 399; rejected a recantation, 400; their pitiable state, 406, 407; petitioned her Majesty, 407—413; their release from prison by the efforts of Burghley, 414, 415; their cause defended by a churchman, 416; punished without witness, verdict, or jury, 417; their character, 416, 421; memorable struggle, 426, 427; Cartwright accused of connexion with Hacket, Coppinger, and Arthington, 428; defence against Sutcliffe, 429—431; license to preach, 431; suspended by order of the queen, 432; his high character, 435, 436, 448, 456—461; invited by Lord Zouch to Guernsey, and his return, 435; preached to the last, 436; prospect of death, and preparation for heaven, 436—438; ministrations honoured, 436; last sermon, 436, 437; glimpse of heaven, *ib.*; triumphant death, *ib.*, 461; his views of religious liberty imperfect, 438; principles of nonconformity, 439—447; had preached at Cambridge, 448; censured by opponents, *ib.*, 449; rumour of having renounced his principles, *ib.*—452; letter to Sir M. Hicks, *ib.*, 453; accusation of having died rich, 454—456; offers of preferment declined, 457; his remarkable benevolence, *ib.*—458; distinguished learning, 460; his works on practical religion, 461—469.

Cathedrals dens of robbers, 9.

Catholics great sufferers, 254; their colleges founded, 255.

Chadderton, Dr., accused Cartwright, 51.

———— L., attended religious assemblies, 337; petitioned in favour of Cartwright and others, 398, 399; corresponded with Cartwright, 434.

Charke, W., expelled from the university, 144; attended religious assemblies, 337.

Christianity extends its benefits, 28, 29; appoints its own agency, *ib.*; unfettered benefit of, *ib.*; success of, when opposed, 211; its mighty triumphs, 478, 479.

Church and state united, 2; ruinous to religious freedom, 3; applauded by persecutors, but enslaved the people, 4; authority of, refuted, 279—281.

———— of England, form of, unknown to the apostles, 32; differed from churches of Christ, 210, 211, 472; departed from Scripture, 418; sought in vain to obtain uniformity, 419.

———— of Rome slighting the Scriptures, 281.

Churches early degenerated, 1; required to be ordered by the New Testament, 29; the institutions of Christ, 33; apostolical, popular, independent, and unalterable, *ib.*; mistaken views of, dangerous, 89; their deplorable state, 92, 93; under subjection to Christ, 441, 442.

Churton's severe censure of Cartwright examined, 452—454.

Clarke, W., wrote to Cartwright, 251.

Cleavely, H., took the oath *ex officio*, 386; what he deposed, 387.

Clergy, deplorable state of, 5; claiming civil power condemned by the fathers, 201.

———— marriages defended, 21.

Coercion in religion the worst despotism, 28, 29, 34; contrived in dark ages, 29; its injurious influence, 34, 446; forbidden, 88; will exist only on the page of history, 418.

Coke, Sir E., his views of bondage, 232.

Conference, sought by the puritans, 153.

Conferences defended by Cartwright and others, 411.

Confirmation by a bishop, 124.

Consciences not state property, but belong to Christ, 14, 27; exempt from human law, 196.

Constantine at first allowed religious freedom, 2; then became dictator of churches, *ib.*, 27; his cruelties, 2, 3; his character, 3.
Controversies between Cartwright and Whitgift, 106—125, 169—201.
Convocation exhorted by Cranmer, 6; of 1562, 10.
Cooke, Dr., pressed Cartwright to answer the Rhemist translation, 262.
Correspondence with continental divines, 19—23.
Council, the, promoted reformation, 8; favoured persecuted ministers, 229.
Cox, Dr., sought a purer reformation, 6; appointed to defend images in worship, 20; administered the sacrament trembling, 21; correspondence with Gaulter and Martyr, 23; a zealous reformer, 24; threatened by the queen, 135; champion of the church, 151, 152.
Coverdale, M., translated the Bible, 5.
Crane, N., died in Newgate, 221.
Cranmer, Abp., zealous for reformation, 4, 6; maintained the identity of bishops and pastors, 6; his opinion cited, 200.
Crick, Dr., preached at Paul's Cross, 145.
Crucifix, the queen's account of, 11, 12, 20.

Declaration of puritans, 413.
Deering, E., letter of, to Burghley, 67; his troubles, 138, 139.
Despotism of the parliament, 17.
Difference between Church of England and churches of Christ, 210, 211, 472; of their government, *ib.*
Dilemma of the people, 16.
Divine authority, subjection to, first principle of Christianity, 444.
Dod, J., preached Cartwright's funeral sermon, 438; intrusted with his manuscripts, 461.
Dublin, Archbishop of, opposed coercion in religion, 34; offered preferment to Cartwright, 457.

Ecclesiastical power claimed by man, a fatal error, 26—29, 228.
———— persons, may they occupy civil offices? 196—201.
———— machinery injurious to religion, 440.
———— laws multiplied, 477.
———— power belongs to God, not to man, 476.
Edmunds, T., took the oath *ex officio*, 386.
Edward VI., recommended to him, entire removal of papistry, 7; zealous for reformation, 8; his generous principles and amiable piety, *ib.*; complaint of bishops, *ib.*; how far was the Reformation promoted? *ib.*
Edwards, —, attended religious assemblies, 386.
Egerton, S., attended religious assemblies, 337.
Election of ministers discussed, 109, 185—189.
Elizabeth, Queen, accession of, 9; her vast power, 10, 17; wished to retain images in churches, 11, 12, 20; strong leaning to popery, 11, 18; opposed marriage of the clergy, 12; adopted wrong policy, 13, 31; jurisdiction disputed, 15; thwarted the Reformation, 18, 21—26; errors of her administration, 26, 31; claimed the same authority as the pope, 27, 422; wished to have few preachers, 35; commanded Abp. Grindal to diminish their number, *ib.*; visited the university, 40; her parting address, 41; lectured her two Archbishops, 85, 433; issued a proclamation and commissions, 86, 87; suppressed religious exercises, 90; her proposed marriage, 93; proclamation against Cartwright's reply, 132, 133; resolved to root out puritans, 134; she meddled with things above her comprehension, *ib.*; threatened Bp. Cox, suspended Bp. Fletcher and Abp. Grindal, 135; despotic arrangements, 214; insulted and defeated the parliament, 243—247, 391; her government called mild, 392; refused without license to eat flesh in Lent, 422; her schismatical despotism, 433.
Episcopacy derived from popery, 443.
Episcopal ambition exposed, 231.
Error adopted at the Reformation, 26—28; the origin of, 87—89.
Essex, the earl of, anecdote of, 312.
Established churches unknown in apostolic times, 32; created by state authority, *ib.*; founded on erroneous principles, 34.
Excommunication, account of, 411.
Exiles zealous reformers, 18.
Expediency substituted for Divine authority, 28, 31; not honoured of God, 34; not the rule of obedience, 441.

Farmer, —, involved in troubles, 341.
Fenn, H., petitioned from prison, 341; convened before the Star Chamber, 356; accused of altering petitions, 360; subscribed a petition, 373; answered interrogatories, 385; favoured in prison, 393.
Fenner, D., tutor to Cartwright, 40; ordained at Antwerp, 221, 310; his "Sacred Theologie" prefaced by Cartwright, 221, 222.
Field, J., joint-author of the "Admonition," 97; committed to Newgate, *ib.*; other troubles, 341.
Fletcher, Bp., suspended, 135.

Fletcher, Mr., attended religious assemblies, 338.
Fortescue, —, one of the Star Chamber, 346.
Freeholds, benefices are, 416.
Freke, Bp., summoned Cartwright, 292.
Fulke, Dr., pressed Cartwright to answer the Rhemists, 262; his publications against them, 288, 289.
Fuller, Councellor, not allowed to defend his clients, 346.

Gardiner, Bp., noticed, 401.
Gaulter advocated entire reformation, 25.
Gawdy, Justice, dictated to prisoners how they should answer charges, 362.
Goad, Dr., urged Cartwright to answer the Rhemists, 262; united in petitioning for the release of Cartwright and others, 398, 399.
Goodman, Dean, subscribed the warrant for apprehending Cartwright, 156.
Gospel contains the Saviour's administration, 31—33; diffusion of, subverting papal power, 475.
Governing churches, the power of, not in man, 441.
Greenham, R., united in religious assemblies, 337.
Gregory, M., principal translator of the Rhemist Testament, 256.
Grindal, Bp., appointed to dispute against images in places of worship, 20; dissatisfied with the imperfect Reformation, 22; sought advice from P. Martyr, *ib.*, 35; contended for a better reformation, 22, 23; his joint-letter to Bullinger and Gaulter, 22; their strong language in favour of reform, 23; Grindal refused to abridge the number of preachers, 35; punished separatists, 53; recommended severity, *ib.*; lenity pressed upon him by Zanchius, *ib.*; his severe letter to the chancellor, 54, 55; incurred the queen's displeasure, 135; letter to Bullinger concerning puritans, 136.
Grise, —, ordained abroad, 310.

Habits, clerical, dispute of, 115—118.
Hacket, Coppinger, and Arthington, the conspirators, noticed, 428, 429.
Hales, J., against prelatical supremacy, 231; on freedom of conscience, 445.
Harrison, R., answer to, 304.
Hart, —, ordained abroad, 310.
Hastings, Sir Francis, the friend of Cartwright, 434.
Hatton, Lord Chancellor, Cartwright's letter to, 318.
Head of the church, the exclusive prerogative of Jesus Christ, 169, 287, 444.
"Hexapla," English, published, 256.
Hicks, M., his kindness to Cartwright, 160; Cartwright's epistles to, 397, 452, 453, 456.
Henry VIII. pope of England, 4.
High-commission created, 10; a stretch of power, *ib.*; a real inquisition, 334; its accusations, 337; its prosecutions, 148, 339, 346—351, 416, 444; its authority called in question, 416.
Hooker, R., his two-fold rule of obedience, 115; singular statement, 118; remarkable position, 120; comment on the head of the church, 173; necessity of archbishops, 184; his bold affirmation, 189, 190; "Ecclesiastical Polity" noticed, 212; admired by the pope, 213; defended the oath *ex officio*, 333; his defence of ecclesiastical power, 420; remarkable declaration, 423; ascribed to the king the power usurped by the pope, 424.
Hooper, Bp., advocated entire reformation, 7, 417; addressed King Edward, 7; pleaded for frequent preaching, 35; censured bishops for claiming civil power, 200; his notable declaration, 417.
Horn, Bp., wrote to Bullinger, deploring the state of the Reformation, 22; reminded Gaulter of the prospect of improvement, *ib.*; a zealous reformer, 24; his extreme severity, 153.
Human authority in the churches of Christ unwarrantable, 417.
Hume, his views of the Established Church, 247, 252; of liberty kindled and preserved by the puritans, 248; his censure of ecclesiastical proceedings, 333, 334.
Humphrey, Dr., addressed the queen in favour of reformation, 24, 25.

Idol of the queen, account of, 11, 20, 21.
Images rejected from the churches, 11; dispute whether they should be restored, 20.
Immunities of churches assailed, 210.
Imprisonment considered desirable, 421.
Improvements under Edward VI., 8.
Intercourse with God regulated by act of parliament, 17; usurping the power of Deity, 417.
Interference between man and his Maker dangerous, 478.
Interrogatories to the puritans, 362—365, 390.
Intolerance, prevalence of, 252, 253.

James, King, offered Cartwright preferment, 221, 447; letter to the Queen in favour of Cartwright and others, 336.

Jesus Christ, Governor of his churches, 7; King in his own kingdom, 13, 14, 420; his authority the only basis of reform, 29, 35; his administration fixed, 30, 31; required entire reformation, 35, 36; sovereign Lord of his churches, 35, 425, 447; the benefit of, 36; only Lawgiver and Judge, 420, 473, 474; only Head of the church, 444, 445; bequeathed perfect religious freedom, 445.
Jewel, Bp., opposed the title of "head of the church," 19; lamented the state of the Reformation, *ib.*; censured the clerical habits, *ib.*, 20; corresponded with Martyr, Bullinger, and Lavater, 19—21; denounced the queen's idol, 20; appointed to dispute about images, 20; sought a perfect reformation, 21; his "Apologie" noticed, *ib.*, 204; his agreement with Cartwright, 109.
——, M., petition from, 341; convened before the Star Chamber, 356; subscribed a petition, 373.
Johnson, F., noticed, 306.
———, J., took the oath *ex officio*, 386.
———, R., stirring letter to Bp. Sandys, 156; died in the Gatehouse, *ib.*
Justices, ten, petitioned Hatton and Burghley against ecclesiastical abuses, 354.

King, A., united in religious assemblies, 338; subscribed petition from prison, 341; convened before the Star Chamber, 356; subscribed petition, 373; answered interrogatories, 385; favoured in prison, 393.
——, Chancellor, remarkable statement of, 195.
Kingdom of Christ spiritual, 446.
Knewstubbs, J., attended religious assemblies, 337.
Knollys, Sir Francis, concerned in destroying the queen's idol, 20; defence of the queen's supremacy, 205, 353; suggested that Archbishop Whitgift ought to recant, 205, 206; denominated an honest man, 205; checked the power of bishops, 230, 231; addressed Archbishop Whitgift, *ib.*, 232; letter to Burghley, 373, 374; advocate of freedom, 391; his sympathy for prisoners, 398.

Labours, ministerial, of Cartwright, 307.
Lacy, a printer, apprehended, 147.
Lark, —, attended religious assemblies, 338.
Latin Vulgate, the Rhemists translated, 257; popes disagreed concerning it, 275.
Laws, human, not for governing the churches of Christ, 33, 417, 419.
Laws of Christ the laws of churches, 442, 445; identified with the gospel, 443; every deviation from, dissent, *ib.*
Legislators invaded the province of Deity, 14, 424; the mischief of, 15.
Leicester, Earl of, letter to Abp. Whitgift and his reply, 232, 233; presented Cartwright to the hospital, 235; pressed him to answer the Rhemists, 259; offered Cartwright the provostship of Eton college, 457.
Leighton, Sir Thomas, patron of Cartwright, 434.
Lever, T., a celebrated reformer, 37; master of St. John's college, 38.
Lewin, Dr., opposed Cartwright, 348, 350.
Littleton, E., his troubles, 341; took the oath *ex officio*, 386.
Livings considered freeholds, 416.
London ministers arraigned at Lambeth, 47; recommended Cartwright to answer the Rhemists, 260.
Longworth, Dr. John, expelled from the mastership of a college, 293.
Lord chancellor a member of the Star Chamber, 346; addressed Burghley, 353.
Lord chief justices members of the Star Chamber, 346.
Lord, E., convened before the Star Chamber, 356; accused of altering petitions, 360; subscribed petitions from prison, 341, 373; replied to interrogatories, 384, 385; his care of the hospital at Warwick, 456.

Man responsible to God alone, 16—18; his intercourse with God regulated by act of parliament, 17; required to choose religion, 27, 28; he compels—God persuades, 35.
Magistrates, the duty of, stated, 88, 89, 417.
Margaret professorship founded, 48.
Marriage of clergy opposed by the queen, 12, 21.
Martin Mar-prelate, anecdote of, 312; disapproval of, 315—318, 389.
Martyr, Peter, advocated entire reformation, 6; correspondence with English reformers, 19.
Martyrs, heroic death of, 9; their honourable claim, 28, 425.
Mary, Queen, her mournful accession, 8; cruelties practised, and their impressions, 9.
Mass, the popish, deceives the people, 285.
Memorial addressed to Cartwright, 260—262.
Method of Rhemist translation, 178, 179.
Milton cited, 14.

Minds of men long enslaved, 9, 10.
Ministers made state functioners, 3; not to use secular power, 29; their duties stated, 30; many ejected, 90; election of, 109—111; prosecuted by ecclesiastical power, 341; the free choice of, 440; forbidden to exercise lordship, 441.
Montague, J., correspondence with Cartwright, 434.
Morrice, J., wrote against the oath *ex officio*, 332; declaration in parliament, 391; his imprisonment, and exposure of the bishops, 392.

Nares, Dr., his statement corrected, 382.
Nation, the vassalage of, 249, 250.
National council abhortive, 142.
Newton's, Bp., views of the triumph of religion when opposed by earthly power, 211.
Nowell, Dean, signed the warrant against Cartwright, 156; to confer with Cartwright, 353; mentioned, 453.
Nutter, A., took the oath *ex officio*, 386; what he deposed, 387.

Oath *ex officio* enforced, 314, 329, 408; Whitgift's defence of, 331; arguments against it, 332, 333; its hateful tyranny, *ib.*, 334, 345, 405, 408, 415—418; stand made against it, 353; opposed in the House of Commons, 391.
Obligation, man's, to choose religion, 27, 28; to obey inspired truth, 89, 425.
Obstinacy the character of the priesthood, 9.
Officers of Christian churches, 111—114.

Page had his right hand cut off, 95.
Parker, Abp., declined that preferment, 15; appointed to defend images in churches, 20; convened the London ministers to enforce conformity, 47; stigmatized and opposed Cartwright, 65; censured the puritans, *ib.*; defended himself, 129, 130; pressed the council to intolerance, *ib.*; his activity in this cause, 131; regretted people forsaking the church, 132; the queen admonished him for his severity, 141; further noticed, 453.
Parliament, whether able to transfuse spiritual supremacy, 15, 422—425; act of, most despotic, 15; espoused ecclesiastical reform, 243—247.
Parkhurst, Bp., rejoiced in the demolition of the queen's idol, 20; corresponded with Bullinger, *ib.*; refused at first to be made a bishop, 23; dissatisfied with the Reformation, 23; a zealous reformer, 24.
Paule, Sir George, published a panegyric on Whitgift, 42; depreciated Cartwright, *ib.*, 43.
Payne, J., the troubles of, 341; convened before the Star Chamber, 356; subscribed a petition, 273.
Peach, the queen's fool, demolished her idol, 20.
Penal laws in religion cripple freedom, 476.
Perkins, W., united in religious meetings, 337; took the oath *ex officio*, 386; what he deposed, 387.
Persecution injurious to persecutors, yet much applauded, 379.
Peter, the apostle, did not possess supremacy, 282—285.
Pilkington, Bp., opposed popish relics, 23; his views of religious freedom, *ib.*, 24; recommended the exercise of lenity, *ib.*; lamented abuses, *ib.*; master of St. John's college, 39.
Polyander, the learned, his high character of Cartwright, 460.
Pope, the vast power of, 4.
Popes, their disagreement, 275.
Popery restored by Queen Mary, 9; errors of, failed to instruct protestants, *ib.*; the only safeguard against, 32.
Popham, Attorney General, investigated the case of Cartwright and others, 380; his opinion of, stated, *ib.*; failure to prove them guilty, 381.
Power, assumption of, in religion, mischievous, 4, 417; defeated the Reformation, 27.
Press, liberty of, suppressed, 147, 153, 167.
Preston, Dr., disputed and was rewarded, 41.
Princes, whether they have ecclesiastical authority, 122—124.
Propositions on religious freedom, 426.
Proudlove, W., united in religious assemblies, 338; subscribed petitions from prison, 341, 373; convened before the Star Chamber, 356; did not subscribe the book of discipline, 385.
Puckering, Sergeant, Cartwright's letter to, 308.
Puritans defended, 87; their great sufferings, 90—92, 153, 227; sought a public conference, 153; kindled and preserved the spark of liberty, 248.
Puritan ministers, distresses of, in prison, 378; their constancy under sufferings, 385, 416.

Queen and council required to be obedient to God, 31.

Rebellion, defence against, by Cartwright and others, 409.
Recantation of Abp. Whitgift recommended, 205, 206; offered by Whitgift to Cartwright and others, 400, 401; remarks upon it, 402, 403.

Reformation commenced, 4; how far promoted, 8; subverted by Queen Mary, 9; fatal errors of, 26, 27, 83, 84; defeated by political power, 26; the only sound principle of, 29, 32, 55; stifled by Queen Elizabeth, 30, 32, 87; benefits of, when carried out, 36, 418; duty of all to promote it, 49; principles of, diffused, 50.
Reformers, their struggles for a better state of things, 18, 19; correspondence with foreigners, 19—23; advocated a thorough reformation, 25, 28—32; borne down by political power, 26, 27; the noblest benefactors, 35; their honourable principles, 35, 36.
Religion, early corrupted, 1; a personal concern, 1, 28, 425; not promoted by expediency, 28, 31; freedom of, subverted by coercion, 88.
Religious principle little known, 158.
——— liberty defended, 88, 425—427; the people robbed of it, 17, 476; the Creator's gift, 476; the benefit of its triumphs, 477, 488.
Responsibility, man's, to God alone, 16.
Rhemist translation of the New Testament published, 256; opposed the Scriptures of God, 272, 273; from the Latin Vulgate, 274—276.
Ridley, Bp., noticed, 200, 453.
Right of private judgment, defence of, 89; the gift of God, 446.
Robbing men of the richest gift of God, 474, 476.
Rulers, their usurpation of power, 30.
Rumour of Cartwright having renounced his nonconformity, 449—452.
Rushbrooke, —, involved in troubles, 341.
Russell, Lady, favourable to Cartwright, and his letter to her, 367—371.

Salvation by Christ preached, 3.
Sandys, Bp., opposed images being in places of worship, 21; corresponded with Martyr, *ib.*, 22; zealous advocate of reform, 21, 24; breathed the spirit of intolerance, 132; renounced his reform principles, 135; recommended cutting off the head of Queen of Scots, 137; his joint severe letter, 139, 140; sought to obtain a national council, 142; notable letter to Lord Burghley, 145—147; searched for printing-presses, 148; repented of his severity, 149; letter to Burghley, 150; his severe proceedings, 151, 153; an enemy to frequent preaching and praying, 157.
Say and Sele, Lord, dedication to, 467.
Schism, defence against, by Cartwright and others, 409.
Scott, T., honest statements of, 14, 84.
Scriptures freely read in English, 8; defended against corruption, 274—277; the only law of governing churches, 280, 281, 417, 418.
Secular power not to enforce the truth of God, 1.
Semi-popery notions, 18, 424.
Singularity, defence against, by Cartwright and others, 412.
Snape, E., invited to assist in reforming the churches in Guernsey, 218, 219; united in religious assemblies, 337; accused before the High-commission, 338; subscribed a petition to Lord Burghley, 341; convened before the Star Chamber, 356; accused of altering petitions, 360; subscribed another petition, 373; did not subscribe the book of discipline, 385.
Southey, Dr., that conscience was not forced, 47; defended the oath *ex officio* and High-commission, 344; his disingenuous statement, 449—451.
Spicer, —, attended puritan assemblies, 338.
Standard of dispute between Cartwright and Whitgift, 106—108.
Stanhope, Dr., a member of the High-commission, 346.
Star Chamber, proceedings of, 339, 345, 346, 356—360, 362—365, 383—388.
Statesmen have obscure views of the Reformation, 34; have yet much to learn concerning churches, *ib.*
Stillingfleet, Dr., generous sentiments of, 1, 33.
Stone, T., attended religious assemblies, 338; examined in the Star Chamber, 386.
Stroud, J., convened and examined before the High-commission, 148, 149.
Struggle, the memorable, between the prelates and puritans terminated, 415; a churchman's opinion of it, 416.
Strype, the historian, assailed by the archbishop and others, 11.
Subjection to Christ, the first principle of Christianity, 444.
Subjects in a dilemma, 16.
Succession, apostolical, a popish claim, 206; false and usurped, 417.
Suffolk ministers pressed Cartwright to answer the Rhemists, 260.
Supremacy imparted to Queen Elizabeth, 10, 15; act of, opposed, *ib.*, 16; defended by the puritans, 170, 410; substituted for popish infallibility, 477; of the bishops exposed, 231; of Peter refuted, 382—385.

Supreme head of the church, origin of, 169—173, 423.
Sutcliffe, Dr., accused Cartwright, 295; his errors corrected, 382; censures noticed, 454—456; repented on his death-bed, *ib.*

Testimonials in favour of Cartwright, 57—62.
Throgmorton, J., child of, baptized by Cartwright, 311.
Timothy and Titus not bishops, 176.
Toleration exposed, 432.
Traditions unsafe in religion, 208.
Translation, method of, adopted by the Rhemists, 278, 279.
Transubstantiation indefensible, 286.
Travers, W., silenced from preaching, 48; ordained at Antwerp, 216, 310; his "Plain Declaration," 217; chief author of the book of discipline, 243; attended religious assemblies, 337.
Trent, Council of, declared the church to be the only interpreter of Scripture, 257.

Udal, J., King James interceded for him, 366; died in prison, 367.
Ugnol, a rich citizen, attempted to defraud the hospital at Warwick, 295, 296; defeated and committed to prison, 298.
Uniformity act, severity of, 13; invaded God's prerogative, 14.
———— in religion impossible, 26, 419.
———— sought in vain by Queen Elizabeth, 418.
University, severity of, 144, 145.
Usurpation of power, 417; twofold stated, 423.

Vaughan, Dr., his defence of Cartwright, 451, 452.

Wake, A., preached at Paul's Cross, 146.
Walsingham, Sir Francis, generously urged Cartwright to answer the Rhemists, 259; solemn recollections in the prospect of death, 259, 260.
Walton, incorrect statement of, 459.
Ward, J., united in religious assemblies, 337.
Warwick, Earl of, his death, 293; dedication to, 467.
Warwick hospital, its endowments endangered, 293, 296; distressed state of, 321.
Waterman, J., addressed Cartwright, 252.
Wesley, John, his views of religious liberty, 474.
Whitaker, Dr., urged Cartwright to answer the Rhemists, 262; opinion of Cartwright's publications, 207; attended religious assemblies, 337; petitioned in favour of Cartwright and others, 398, 399.
Whitgift, Dr. John, admitted that the first churches were popular, 32, 33; modern churches not to imitate them, *ib.*; united to promote reform, 46; petitioned against enforcing popish habits, *ib.*; renounced his reform principles, 47; preached against Cartwright, 48; obtained new statutes, 66; accused Cartwright to the chancellor of the university, 63; expelled him from the university, 74; jealous of Cartwright having friends, 76; testimonial respecting conference, 80; prepared his "Answer" to the "Admonition," 103; his book censured, 142—144; made Bishop of Worcester, 161, 162; "Answer" and "Defence" noticed, 163—167, 203, 204; rebuked by Lord Burghley, 226; refused to license Cartwright to preach, 233, 234; crushed the reformers, and opposed reform, 240, 244; his severities at Cambridge, 247, 248; prohibited Cartwright from writing against papists, 262—264; articles against Cartwright, 309—315; Whitgift admonished by Burghley, 324, 330; his haughty spirit and vain promises, 399, 406; his elevation regretted, 401; character stated, 402—404; splendid retinue, 403, 404; ascribed to the queen the power usurped by the pope, 422; died of grief, 438; opinion of Cartwright, 449.
Whittingham, Dean, complained of abuses, and advocated reform, 24.
Wiggins, —, in troubles, 341.
Wight, D., subscribed petitions from prison, 341, 373; convened before the Star Chamber, 356; answer to interrogatories, 384, 385.
Wilcocks, T., joint-author of the "Admonition," 97; committed to Newgate, and visited by his brethern, *ib.*; addressed by Gilby, 161.
Woodcock, T., committed to Newgate for selling the "Admonition," 151.
Word of God, the only origin and rule of religion, 88, 89, 441.
Worthington, T., a Rhemist translator, 259.
Wycliffe exposed popish doctrine, 289; his views of the Reformation, 418, 479.

Zanchius recommended Archbishop Grindal to exercise lenity towards puritans, 53.
Zouch, Lord, invited Cartwright to Guernsey, 434.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY W. BLANCHARD AND SONS,
Warwick Lane, St. Paul's.

Date Due

[redacted]			
[redacted]			
[redacted]			
[redacted]			

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01039 9501